

AN EXAMINATION OF CURRENT OR PROPOSED RITES FOR
THE ORDINATION OR CONSECRATION OF BISHOPS IN
THE CHURCH OF SOUTH INDIA, THE CHURCH OF CHRIST
UNITING (U.S.A.), THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH, THE
EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE U.S.A., AND THE CHURCH OF
ENGLAND

Kendall Kane McCabe

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of PhD
at the
University of St Andrews



1980

Full metadata for this item is available in
St Andrews Research Repository
at:

<http://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/>

Please use this identifier to cite or link to this item:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10023/13581>

This item is protected by original copyright



ProQuest Number: 10171202

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10171202

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

Th 9399

AN EXAMINATION OF CURRENT OR PROPOSED
RITES FOR THE ORDINATION OR CONSECRATION OF BISHOPS
IN THE CHURCH OF SOUTH INDIA,
THE CHURCH OF CHRIST UNITING (U.S.A.),
THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH,
THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE U.S.A.,
AND THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

by Kendall Kane McCabe, A.B., M.A., M.Div.

submitted to
The University of St. Andrews
in partial fulfillment
of requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
January 25, 1980

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the following thesis is based on the results of research carried out by myself, that it is my own composition and that it has not previously been presented for a Higher Degree. The research was carried out at the University of St. Andrews under the supervision of the Rev. J. Michael Keeling.

Kendall K. McCabe

CERTIFICATE

I certify that Kendall Kane McCabe has fulfilled the conditions of the resolution of the University Court, 1967 No. 1, and that he is qualified to submit this thesis in application for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

J. Michael Keeling
St. Mary's College
University of St. Andrews



ABSTRACT

McCabe, Kendall Kane, An Examination of Current or Proposed Rites for the Ordination or Consecration of Bishops in the Church of South India, the Church of Christ Uniting (U.S.A.), the Roman Catholic Church, the Episcopal Church in the U.S.A., and the Church of England.

The rites for the consecration (ordination) of bishops in the churches listed in the title are examined against the background of the development of episcopal functions through the centuries, the controversies about the nature of the episcopate as a third order of ministry, and recent statements about the nature of episcopal ministry. Four issues are isolated as being paramount for understanding the present position of the episcopate in the West: (1) the development of the doctrine of apostolic succession; (2) the theological controversies concerning the relation of the episcopate to the presbyterate; (3) in Roman Catholicism, the papal claims to an immediate jurisdiction superior to the bishops; and (4) in Anglicanism, with major consequences for all subsequent ecumenical discussion, the effect of the Oxford Movement with its insistence upon the importance of the historic episcopate. Three sets of contemporary documents are analyzed to see how they have dealt with the four issues in light of the needs of the contemporary Church: (1) from the documents of Vatican II, the second chapter of Lumen Gentium and the pastoral decree, Christus Dominus; (2) from the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches, the agreed statement drafted at Accra in 1974, The Ordained Ministry in Ecumenical Perspective; and (3) the preparatory papers and subsequent reports of the 1978 Lambeth Conference. The five rites are then examined to see how they

reflect both the historical issues and the positions set forth in the recent documents.

The examination of the rites is divided into two parts. First, the rites themselves are reproduced in full as headnotes with accompanying historical and liturgical annotations. Then, at the end of each rite, there is an essay discussing how the issues raised in the first three chapters have been treated and the implications for understanding the issues in terms of text and rubric. A final essay deals with the lections appointed to be read in the services, comparing and contrasting the choices made, discussing the implications of those choices, and considering how they might be used as the basis for the ordination sermon.

The final chapter summarizes the liturgical and theological approaches represented by the rites and discusses briefly how, on the basis of those rites, the ministry of bishops is to be understood in the churches which employ them.

A C K N O W L E D G M E N T S

My two years of residence in St. Andrews provided me with the finest opportunity I have had to pursue a subject of interest without interruption in the midst of a congenial and supportive community. I am indebted to Principal Whyte, who not only introduced me to St. Mary's College, but made me feel a part of it, and to his secretary, Miss Masie Blackwood, whose understanding and good humour will be long remembered.

The thesis owes much to the kindness of Dr. J.S. Alexander, Lecturer in Ecclesiastical History, and Dr. A.J.M. Wedderburn, Lecturer in New Testament Language and Literature, for their reading, evaluating, and making many valuable suggestions on the work as it was in progress. I appreciate the many resources to which I was directed by them. I am also grateful for the cooperation I received from the staff of the University library.

Outside the St. Andrews community, I would like to thank Canon G.J. Cuming for the interviews I had with him, Dean R.C.D. Jasper and the Church House staff of the General Synod's Liturgical Commission for their hospitality in allowing the use of their resources, and Mr. James Schellman of the International Commission on English in the Liturgy for his help in locating elusive materials and providing current information on the work of the Commission.

And finally, simply because the first shall be last, I must express my indebtedness to my supervisor, the Rev. J.M. Keeling, for his insistence from the beginning on establishing a structure and keeping to

schedule, for his thoughtful and constructive suggestions all along the way, and for his sense of humour which enabled me to keep my perspective in the midst of ever-expanding material.

To all of these, for their contributions to the thesis, and for the shared life of St. Mary's, my gratitude and appreciation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter One: The Development of Episcopal Functions

I. The Formative Period - - - - -	1
A. New Testament Roots- - - - -	1
1. Christ's Ministry- - - - -	1
2. The Community's Ministry - - - - -	5
3. Specialized Ministries in the New Testament- - - - -	9
B. The Catholic Development - - - - -	25
1. The Second and Third Centuries - - - - -	25
2. The Fourth and Fifth Centuries - - - - -	43
3. The Evidence of Early Ordination Rites - - - - -	53
II. Since the Reformation- - - - -	64
A. The Background to Reformation- - - - -	64
B. The Roman Episcopate from Trent to Vatican II- - - - -	69
C. The Anglican State-Episcopate- - - - -	76
1. The Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries- - - - -	77
2. The Eighteenth Century - - - - -	84
3. The Oxford Movement and Beyond - - - - -	86

Chapter Two: The Development of Episcopal Identity

I. Apostolic Succession - - - - -	89
II. Presbyterate and Episcopate: Orders or Degrees? - - - - -	100
III. Episcopal-Papal Conflict - - - - -	112
IV. The Oxford Movement and the "Historic Episcopate"- - - - -	125

Chapter Three: Three Recent Statements Relating to the Ministry and Function of Bishops

Introduction- - - - -	135
I. Roman Catholic	
A. Lumen Gentium- - - - -	136

B. Christus Dominus- - - - -	148
C. A Summary of Vatican II's Theory and Practice of Episcopacy- - - - -	161
II. Ecumenical	
A. The Ordained Ministry in Ecumenical Perspective - - - -	166
III. Anglican: The 1978 Lambeth Conference	
Introduction - - - - -	185
A. Considered Opinions: The Preparatory Articles - - - - -	186
B. A Sectional Report of the Lambeth Conference- - - - -	207
C. The Ministry of Bishops in the Official Resolutions - -	216
Chapter Four: An Examination of Five Recent Episcopal Consecration Rites	
Introduction - - - - -	223
I. The Church of South India	
A. Rite and Notes- - - - -	225
B. Commentary- - - - -	237
II. The Roman Pontifical	
A. Rite and Notes- - - - -	244
B. Commentary- - - - -	278
III. The Church of Christ Uniting	
A. Rite and Notes- - - - -	299
B. Commentary- - - - -	306
IV. The Episcopal Church in the U.S.A.	
A. Rite and Notes- - - - -	315
B. Commentary- - - - -	334
V. The Church of England	
A. Rite and Notes- - - - -	344
B. Commentary- - - - -	358
VI. The Lections in Episcopal Consecration Rites- - - - -	368
Chapter Five: Summary and Conclusions- - - - -	380

Select Bibliography- - - - -	406
------------------------------	-----

Appendix A: Hippolytus' Episcopal Consecration Prayer	
1. Latin- - - - -	412
2. English- - - - -	413

Appendix B: The Episcopal Consecration Prayer in the Leofric Missal	
1. Latin- - - - -	414
2. English- - - - -	415

Appendix C: The Episcopal Consecration Prayer in the Leonine Sacramentary	
1. Latin- - - - -	416
2. English- - - - -	417

Appendix D: An Outline of the Anglican Form for the Consecration of Bishops in the Ordinals of 1549 to 1662 - - - - -	419
--	-----

Appendix E: A Comparison of Orders of Service in the Ordination Rites - - - - -	425
--	-----

Appendix F: The Structure of Episcopal Consecration in the Former and Present Roman Pontificals - - - - -	428
--	-----

Appendix G: The Distribution of Lessons used in Episcopal Ordinations- - - - -	429
---	-----

CHAPTER ONE: THE DEVELOPMENT OF EPISCOPAL FUNCTIONS

I. The Formative Period

A. New Testament Roots

Before looking at any specific aspects of episcopacy, it will first be necessary to examine briefly the community in and for which it emerged as an identifiable office. Christianity began as a community of believers, united by their faith in the resurrection of Christ and living in shared expectation of that eschatological fulfillment which was described as "the new Jerusalem." It is not difficult to assemble New Testament texts that point to the fostering of Christian community as the goal towards which are directed the behavior of Christians, the efforts of various specialized ministries, and the redeeming action of Christ through his Spirit. If we are to understand the form of episcopacy which arose from and was intended to be both representative of and nurturing to that community it is crucial that we first examine the kind of community it was, how it perceived itself, and what it understood its nature and goals to be, according to the evidence of the New Testament.

1. Christ's Ministry

Though they may neglect it in the course of their practical Christian activity, all churches in all periods of history admit in some form the principle that Christ alone is the ultimate possessor of priesthood and ministry in the Church.¹ This means that the understanding of Christ's own ministry

1. As contemporary examples: "It is our common belief that, in the New Covenant of the Lord Jesus Christ, he alone is priest in his own right." (Towards Reconciliation: The Interim Statement of the Anglican-Methodist

is determinative of any insight into Christian ministry, whether it be the ministry of the community as a whole or that of the bishop. Because the basic question, "What did Christ do, and what, if anything, is he still doing?" is at the heart of the view one takes of Christianity, it seems logical to begin our study by seeking in the New Testament some insight into primitive Christianity's faith about the risen Lord's activity in the midst of his people.

We are here confronted with the entire matter of early Christian faith in the resurrection of Jesus and with the extremely divergent interpretations of that faith that are given by present-day scholars.² For our purposes it will suffice to note that the Christians who produced the New Testament writings believed in the continuing influence of the Risen One in their lives and destiny.³ At the very least, the meaning of his death and subsequent glorification transformed the meaning and purpose of their own existence (Rom. 8; I Cor. 15). More than that, his own Spirit moved in their midst to animate and direct their communal and individual life, trans-

Unity Commission, London, 1967, p. 12); "In the bishops, therefore, for whom the priests are assistants, Our Lord Jesus Christ, the supreme High Priest, is present in the midst of those who believe." (Constitution on the Church, 21); "All ministry in the Church is rooted in the ministry of Christ himself, who glorifies the Father in the power of the Holy Spirit. Christ stirs up, calls, strengthens and sends those whom he has chosen for the whole ministry of his Church or for the special ministry, making them the instruments of his message and of his work." (The Fourth World Conference on Faith and Order, Montreal, 1963, ed. Rodger and Vischer, London, 1964, p. 64)

2. W. Pannenburg, Jesus - God and Man (London, 1968), pp. 53-114

3. This seems clearly indicated in a passage like Rom. 8. For a discussion of the relation between the historical Jesus and the risen Christ, see X. Léon-Dufour, The Gospels and the Jesus of History (London, 1968), pp. 204-76.

forming them into sons of God (Gal. 4:6-7).

The precise question is whether the risen Christ is seen only as an object of faith and commitment, by whose teachings and example Christians are constantly transformed and who thereby find historical fulfillment in such continuing imitation, or whether he is seen also as an ever present and governing agent in the life of the Christian community, not concept but a living person.⁴ In the second of these perspectives he continues to witness to his Father's saving love; he continues to offer sacrifice for the remission of sin; he continues to give himself in love to men who accept him in faith. Taking Paul's writings as an indication of early Christian faith, it would seem that there is much to indicate that the primitive Church thought of its risen Lord as thus dynamically and personally present in its midst.⁵ Paul's own initial experience of the Risen One, so paradigmatic for all his future experience and understanding, seems unmistakable: the Christ of the Pauline "vision" was a conscious person present in familiar dialogue with Saul. He was neither a voice from the past, nor the personification of an ethical ideal, nor the projection of Saul's own frustrated religious expectations.

It is true that Paul's teaching about the salvific effect of Jesus' death is expressed in the past tense, in terms of what Jesus did; it could not be otherwise about the historical fact of Jesus' dying. But Jesus' death and resurrection are inseparable: without the second the first is meaningless. Begun in the past, a past to which Paul himself is not a di-

4. E. Schillebeeckx, Christ the Sacrament of the Encounter with God (London, 1963), pp. 13-45

5. T. Manson, The Servant Messiah (Cambridge, 1961), pp. 98-99

rect witness, the redeeming act of Christ continues into the present and future. Of this, Paul claims to be witness. Paul sees his own role as co-worker with and ambassador of Christ (I Cor. 4:1; II Cor. 5:20); he speaks of himself as introducing others into the life of Christ (I Cor. 4:15), and as exercising the authority of Christ (I Thess. 4:2). This would be strange language if Paul did not see the risen Christ as a contemporary reality with which he was in contact.

This Pauline perspective is not singular in the New Testament writings. The tenth chapter of Matthew reflects how Christian evangelization was looked upon as being sent by Christ himself.⁶ The Lucan viewpoint is dominated by the risen Lord whose presence to the Christian people is the replacement of the Holy of Holies in the Temple.⁷ The Johannine literature is unintelligible apart from the living Lord who imparts eternal life to those who accept him in faith (John 6), the Lord who invites his disciples to abide in him as he abides in them (John 15).

But if the risen Christ is alive and active in his Church, what is the nature of the ministry that he continues to carry on? There are many ways in which one can view this activity of the risen Christ: it is a role of witness (Rev. 1:5), of reconciliation (Col. 1:22), of granting the Spirit of sonship (Gal. 4:5), of giving life (John 6), of redemption from wickedness (Gal. 1:4). But basic to all these categories is the notion of formation of community. The risen Christ has unified men to himself in his death and resurrection; but it is this death and resurrection that also

6. Bornkamm, Barth and Held, Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew (London, 1963), pp. 17-19

7. H. Conzelmann, The Theology of St. Luke (London, 1960), pp. 80-83, 120-25

reunited men to God (II Cor. 5:19; Gal. 4:4-7), reconciling men who had alienated themselves from the divine (Col. 1:22). The reconciliation also has a horizontal dimension: through his death and resurrection Christ has broken down the walls of division that had separated men from one another (Eph. 2:11-16). Through his self-gift in that act he is linked to his disciples as a bridegroom to his bride (Eph. 5). With his full power and authority as risen Lord, Christ sends his own Spirit of love as the ultimate unifying principle of mankind and principally of the community of faith.

Probably no place does the community-forming function of the risen Christ find more profound expression in the New Testament literature than in the Pauline usage of the notion of "body" (I Cor. 12:12-27; Eph. 4:4-16) and the corresponding Johannine figure of the vine (John 15). The risen Christ acts as the source of life and unity; while he is distinct from his disciples, he forms with them a vital unity which is the very link that binds them to one another. While Christ gives himself in profound intimacy to each believer, he does so in order to bring that believer into deeper communion with the heavenly Father and with all others who acknowledge Christ and the Father in faith.

2. The Community's Ministry

At first sight, the texts of the New Testament seem to indicate that the ministry of the Christian community is for the most part "inward-directed" to the building up of the ekklesia itself. Certainly, most of the ministrations to which Christians are urged have to do with building up the life of the community. Christians are to do good to all men in love,

but "especially to those who are of the household of faith" (Gal. 6:10). The Johannine insistence on mutual love as "the great commandment," while not confined to the relation among Christians, seems quite clearly to find its primary expression in that context: "By this all men will know that you are my disciples, if you have love for one another" (John 13:35). The objective of praising God, which functions in Christ's own ministry, will be achieved through Christians' service to one another in the sharing of their goods (II Cor. 9:12).⁸

The whole Church shares in the ministry of preaching the gospel, of witnessing to the death and resurrection of Christ (Phil. 1:7,14). This seems to be accomplished in great part by the very intrinsic growth in loving community of the people themselves. Their daily life is their sacrifice (Rom. 12:1); they have their diverse functions (diakonai), but these are for the sake of the whole body. They are all to teach and exhort but are to do this for one another (Col. 3:16). Living out its faith constitutes for the community its sacrifice, its offering (Phil. 2:17); and this seems quite clearly linked to Jesus' own servant ministry (which is described in the immediately preceding verses in Phil. 2). Again, it seems that Paul places considerable stress on the sufferings of the early Christians, probably in the context of prophetic witness (Phil. 1:27-30).

While there is no conscious reflection upon the nature of the process of witnessing to faith traditions within the infant Church, the existence of the New Testament is evidence that they did so witness. Actually, the

8. The priestly overtones of such ministry should not be overlooked: the phrase used is diakonia tes leitourgias tautes.

word "paradosis" very quickly became a word with accepted technical meaning, perhaps as early as Paul's first letter to the Corinthians (I Cor. 11:23; 15:3ff).⁹ And the missionary envoys, the apostles, who went out from communities like Jerusalem to evangelize the Mediterranean world, were expected to expound not only their own personal faith but also that of the community which had sent them. This they did by teaching the new Christians their own creed and also their liturgical usages. Thus tradition was from the beginning given expression through "scripture" and "sacrament."^{9a}

All the elements of the New Testament writing indicate that some members of the early Church enjoyed a special role in this process of witnessing to the community's developing faith traditions: the Gospels by their accounts of the commission given to the Twelve (Matt. 28:18), and in a particular way to Peter (Matt. 16:18; John 21:15-19), Acts with its narration of the evangelization undertaken by individuals like Paul and Barnabas, Paul's own letters with their references to his own apostolate and to that of others. It is less clear just who ~~was responsible~~ was responsible for such special witness. Inevitably it fell to some extent on anyone in the community who was in a position of leadership, even parents with regard to their children. The traveling apostles who brought the faith to new places and there helped establish communities were clearly recognized as special witnesses.¹⁰ It seems, too, that the earliest con-

9. F. Büchsel, "Paradosis," in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, vol. 2, pp. 172-73

9a. F. Hahn, The Worship of the Early Church (Philadelphia, 1973), pp. 55-56

10. E. Schweizer, Church Order in the New Testament (London, 1961), pp. 194-97

verts of such apostles thereafter played a special part in guiding the community's faith, and it was not unusual to number them among the presbyteroi.¹¹ Where they existed, the episkopoi were charged with bearing witness to the authentic tradition of faith. Certainly this is a recognized "episcopal" function by the time of the Pastorals (Titus 1:9; 2:7-10).

Actually, once we move past the first stage of evangelization and conversion, in which the apostle holds a unique position, all of the people in the community must have shared to quite an extent in the responsibility of bearing witness about the faith which they themselves had received. This they did to one another as they prayed together, celebrated the sacraments, or discussed the teaching of Jesus or the apostles or their own understanding of the realities of the Christian life. This would do also whenever they brought the good news of Christ to non-Christians. Such missionary endeavor was something shared by all Christians in the early centuries. This does not say that all shared equally in shaping Christian faith by witnessing to the community's traditions; all shared somewhat in this, but leadership did immediately emerge to give direction and some unity to the process of tradition.

Certainly, there was not a limitation of ministry to the needs of Christians alone. The parable of the Good Samaritan, the scene at Jacob's well, the cure of the Syro-Phoenician's daughter, all state explicitly that no narrow chauvinism is to characterize Christian ministry. Such limita-

11. I confess this to be reasoned conjecture. While the Pauline letters indicate that the initial converts of a church often played a special leadership role, Paul never employs the term presbyteros, and there is no evidence of a presbyteral structure in the early Pauline communities. See H. von Campenhausen, Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries (London, 1969), pp. 55-83.

tion to intra-mural interests would be a denial of the missionary character that is essential to the Christian community.¹² Nor was evangelization of non-believers or service to non-Christians a ministry limited to designated individuals. Definite tasks were on occasion assigned to individuals or groups, as to Paul or the Twelve; but the basic function of witnessing to the gospel in word and deed pertained to all in the community. Yet, in the midst of all this, one cannot avoid the impression that the principal ministry of the community was exercised by being, precisely by being a community of faith and love, and as such bearing witness to the presence of God's saving action in Christ and the Spirit.¹³

3. Specialized Ministries in the New Testament

When we turn to the New Testament treatment of specialized ministries, we are provided much fuller textual evidence. It is here, too, that we encounter all the semantic and historical problems about the exact historical referent of such terms as episkopos, presbyteros, apostolos, and diakonos. It must suffice to say here that we will have to settle for less than certainty about the exact historical situation of the ministry in the first few decades of the Church. Our intention now is to examine the evidence concerning the nature of ministry in the New Testament, a ministry which was one, at least, of the sources of the episcopal office; it would seem best to do such an examination without first committing ourselves to any

12. R. Schnackenburg, The Church in the New Testament (New York, 1965), pp. 135-40

13. Karl Rahner, in The Church and the Sacraments (New York, 1963), develops this theme of the community's faith and love making present the redeeming presence of God.

of the theories of the rise of episcopacy and thus possibly prejudicing our reading of the New Testament evidence.

There can be little doubt that whatever functions did exist, they were meant to increase the vitality and unity of the Christian people. Paul's writings are most explicit in this matter. His own preaching is aimed at bringing into existence a community of believers, and his continuing exhortation of his converts is directed to avoiding dissensions in their midst. He reminds the churches that whatever charisms are given, these are for the one body (I Cor. 12:12). He sees prophecy as superior to tongues, precisely because prophecy is directly related to building up the community of faith (I Cor. 14:22). Superior to all other gifts is the Spirit of love which is itself the very bond of unity (I Cor. 13). If Paul himself has authority (and this would seem to apply to others also), it is given to him from the Lord for the building up of the community (II Cor. 10:8); he is a co-worker with God, but "the work" in question is the community itself. (I Cor. 3:9).

Ephesians reiterates the teaching of the early Pauline letters: the various gifts that come from the Spirit are all for the sake of the one body; they are diverse because the needs of the body are diverse, and no particular function can claim precedence over others (Eph. 4:7-13). While the Pastorals deal explicitly with the role of the presbyteros-episkopos, it is clear that this function and the suitability of a given individual to occupy this position are measured against the welfare of the community (I Tim. 3:1-7; Titus 1:5-9).¹⁴

14. Implicitly the Pastorals may also give us (in the role attributed to

In the gospels, the pastoral office, whether spoken of generally or applied to the Twelve or to Peter, is quite clearly one of fostering the communal life of the believing followers of Jesus.¹⁵ Jesus' own work is described as one of molding his groups of followers into a unity. His exhortations to fraternal communion are perhaps more explicitly stated in the Johannine texts, but the synoptics share with John the basically community-oriented view of Jesus' work as one of bringing into being the new people of God in the koine diatheke. Those who are commissioned to special responsibility within the apostolic community are meant to carry on essentially the same task as Jesus: to shepherd the flock.¹⁶

Acts presents basically the same evidence: the early Christians grouped together in closely-knit communities, bound together by their faith and concern for one another, and expressing this deeper unity in their worship and, at least in some instances, by their sharing of earthly goods; and in their midst certain more prominent members were charged in differing fashion with preserving and developing this community of Christian life.¹⁷

Of the many influences that impinged upon Christianity as it came into existence, that of the religion of Old Testament Israel was of paramount importance. Not only were very many of the earliest Christians drawn from the Jewish community, but also Jesus himself was Jewish and thoroughly

Timothy and Titus) some evidence for the travelling ministry. See J. Daniélou, The Theology of Jewish Christianity (London, 1964), pp. 346-56.

15. K. Schelkle, Discipleship and Priesthood (New York, 1965), pp. 33-58

16. Schelkle, pp. 39-42

17. Schnackenburg, pp. 17-34

steeped in the traditions of his people. The New Testament portrayal of Jesus depicts him as understanding his own identity and mission against the background of Israel's religious history; and while it is difficult to determine the exact extent to which the New Testament texts bring us into contact with the historical reality of Jesus of Nazareth, his "Jewishness" is probably one of the most trustworthy elements in the New Testament picture.

On the other hand, the New Testament communities very soon saw that there was also a radical distinctiveness of Christianity vis-a-vis Judaism.¹⁸ Determining the nature and extent of this "newness" is important for our study, since there are some indications that later periods in the Church's history involved a loss of insight about the uniqueness of Christianity and a tendency to revert to the thought and institutional patterns of the Old Testament.¹⁹ This is a many-faceted question, but for our purposes it is necessary that we examine only two elements: the manner in which early Christianity's view of itself as a community with a priestly mission corresponded to Israel's notion of itself as a community, and the respective views of the two communities regarding the role of ministerial groups in fostering the community's life.²⁰

New Testament evidence, as far back as we can trace it, points to a tension in early Christianity's view of its relation with Judaism.²¹

18. Schnackenburg, pp. 118-23

19. See M.-D. Chenu, Nature, Man, and Society in the Twelfth Century (Chicago, 1968), pp. 146-61. This will be particularly obvious in the images employed in consecration prayers.

20. On Old Testament thinking about the manner in which ministry functioned as service to the community, see R. de Vaux, Ancient Israel (London, 1961), pp. 345-57.

21. H. Küng, The Church (London, 1967), pp. 107-25

Increasingly, though not without decades of conflict within the Church itself, the Christians broke with Judaism and emphasized the differences that separated them.²² Yet, throughout, the fundamental thread of continuity joined them with the Old Testament traditions and with the evolution of Israel as a religious entity. The Church was the "new Israel," the new people of God, which entered into the inheritance promised to Abraham. Its community existence was grounded in the new covenant effected in Jesus' death and resurrection; but this new covenant stood as the fulfillment of the covenant dispensation that Old Testament thought traced back to Sinai. The total event of Christianity was viewed as a realization of the promises, explicit or implicit, contained in Old Testament revelation and history - "that the Scriptures might be fulfilled."²³ Christianity's emergence on the historical scene in the resurrection of Jesus and in the sending of the Spirit was seen as that "day of the Lord" proclaimed by Israel's great prophets. The Church was the awaited kingdom of the saints, dedicated as was Old Testament Israel to the worship of God but seeing its worship as already perfected in the sacrifice of its high priest Jesus, who is both Son of man and Messiah (Heb. 4:14- 5:10).

While a deep current of continuity bound together Judaism and early Christianity, it flowed at a level of faith in the God of revelation rather than at the surface level of religious institutions.²⁴ In contrast to Old Testament Israel, where religious life was so interwoven with the external

22. J. Bonsirven, Theology of the New Testament (London, 1963), pp. 371-76

23. This aspect of the early Church's view of the Christ-event is more fully discussed in W.G. Kummel, Promise and Fulfillment (London, 1961).

24. Küng, pp. 107-50

structures of social and political life as to be practically indistinguishable from them, the early Christian communities were based almost exclusively on faith in Jesus as Lord and Messiah. This is not to say that no social, political, or cultural factors contributed to the unification of the men and women who formed the infant Church.²⁵ Indeed, the patterns of Jewish life and worship made a significant contribution to the way of life that characterized the early Christian groups.²⁶ Yet, neither common culture, nor common social customs, nor common political affiliation formed the true unification in the early decades of Christianity. Jewish religious cult with its detailed observances, Jewish law, the authoritative guidance of the Jewish priesthood (which historically had absorbed a good deal of the governing role of the vanished monarchy) - with these Christianity broke after a short period of hesitation.²⁷

Perhaps even more important, there seems to have been no particular inclination on the part of the early Christians to substitute for these Jewish institutions a parallel structure of their own. The New Testament gives evidence, on the contrary, of an early insight into the universality of the gospel which militated against its restriction to any limiting context of culture, law, or national identity. Old Testament religion, certainly in the form it took in late Judaism, was marked by a high degree of institutionalization and by a somewhat narrow nationalism that stood in contrast to the broader viewpoint of some of the prophets. Christianity

25. For evidence of such contributions, see O. Cullmann, Jesus and the Revolutionaries (New York, 1970).

26. Daniélou, pp. 315-56

27. D. Stanley, The Apostolic Church in the New Testament (Westminster, Md., 1965), pp. 5-37

accepted neither of these, in large part because of the strong stand taken by Paul in defense of his apostolate among the Gentiles.²⁸

Of particular interest for us is the fact that apparently there was little felt need to provide for the early Christians any of the priestly mediation so insisted upon in Judaism. This is the more striking if, as Acts seems to indicate, a fair number of Jewish priests were converted (6:7). Moreover, this stands in distinction to the situation of the Qumran community, where the official Jerusalem priesthood was rejected as illegitimate but where the assumption was that the continuity of true Israelitic priesthood belonged to the Qumran priests themselves, and that in the day of God's salvation this authentic priesthood would be restored as the privileged mediators of God's actions.²⁹ Of the three key "offices" of mediation that emerged in Old Testament Israel - king, priest, and prophet - only that of prophet (and that in its charismatic and noninstitutionalized form) is found operative in the early decades of Christianity.

In the Christian context, "prophecy" takes on the precise application of the preaching of the gospel (Matt. 4:23). To prophesy is to evangelize, to be a herald of the gospel, to bear witness to the death and resurrection of Jesus who is Messiah and Lord.³⁰ The prophetic role of heralding the coming divine act of salvation which is highlighted in the opening chapter of Deutero-Isaiah is consciously appropriated by early Christianity, as is

28. W. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism (London, 1948), pp. 58-85

29. G. Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls in English (Harmondsworth, Eng., 1968), pp. 45-51

30. G. Friedrich, "Prophetes," TDNT, vol. 6, pp. 828-61

clear from the use of Isaiah 40 at the beginning of each of the Gospels.³¹ Like Jesus before them, and the Old Testament prophets before him, the early Christian apostles exhorted men to that "conversion" which consists in accepting the saving act of the Lord in "his day" (Acts 2:38; 13:23-41).

While much can be gained by a detailed study of the New Testament use of "prophecy" (propheteuin and derivatives), the characteristic parameter of Christian thought on the topic is clarified by the cluster of words connected with "bear witness": testify, evangelize, herald, etc. The Johanne writings contain the most extensive and most theologically sophisticated use of the notion of "witness";³² but already the early epistles of Paul reflect an established usage of the term "witness" in a specialized Christian sense. Paul describes his own preaching to the Thessalonians as a martyrion (II Thess. 1:10). In I Cor. 2:1 he seems to extend this idea: again referring to his preaching, he gives as the object of that preaching to martyrion tou theou; literally this would mean "the testimony of God," and in the context it seems to be an application of the notion of witness to the activity of Jesus himself. Yet, it is necessary to be cautious of such a translation, because Paul also conveys the notion of the Resurrection as God's witness to his Christ, somewhat the way in which God bears witness to lesser heralds such as Paul (Rom. 1:9). Christian faith bears witness to the justice of God, that justice to which law and prophets formerly testified (Rom. 3:21). By the very nature of faith, all believers share in this witness to God; all exercise a prophetic function.

31. Matt. 3:3; Mark 1:3; Luke 3:4; John 1:23

32. H. Strathmann, "Martys," TDNT, vol. 4, pp. 489-504

But it still remains to ask whether or not there was a "prophetic office" in early Christianity comparable to the "office" of episkopos or presbyteros.³³ On New Testament testimony alone, it seems that one can draw the following conclusions:

1. There definitely were some individuals within the community who were referred to as "prophets." In some instances this seems to have been a fairly permanent situation for the individuals concerned (Acts 15:32; 21:10); in other cases there seems to be some evidence that the special charism of prophecy was a temporary gift, provided for a given occasion (I Cor. 14).

2. At the same time, there seems to have been some overlap in the view of the prophetic and the apostolic "office." Paul, for one, definitely thinks of his ministry, which he insists is basically that of preaching the gospel (Gal. 1:11), as the expression of a prophetic vocation (Gal. 1:15).

3. In any event, the special prophetic gift is provided for the sake of the community (I Cor. 14:4). For that reason, it is to be preferred to other charisms like the gift of tongues and should be sought for in prayer (14:1,12). While the manifestation of tongues can serve as a sign to non-believers, the gift of prophecy is a sign provided precisely for believers; it is meant to help form their faith (14:22), and its use is to be governed by the common good of the faith community (14:26-32).

4. The Pastorals, explicitly I Tim. 4:14, seem to indicate that by the stage of development they reflect there is some intrinsic connection between the charism of prophecy and the charism that is provided an epis-

33. K  ng, pp. 396-98

kopos by the imposition of hands.

It might, however, be a mistake to confine our study of the ministries of early Christianity and their relationship to the ministerial office of Old Testament Israel to the classic categories of priest, prophet, and king. Two important functions of later Judaism seem to have had some influence on the emerging social structure of the infant Christian community, and therefore deserve some special attention: the role of the elders in Jewish communities, and the role of the teachers of Israel's traditions. While it would not be accurate to confine the role of the Jewish elders to the final centuries before Christ, for the influence of elders within the local community had been important long before that, it seems that this role acquired increased importance in the post-exilic period, particularly in those communities which could not easily remain in close contact with Jerusalem.³⁴ In Jerusalem, the Sanhedrin, which functioned as a supreme tribunal, was an assembly of key elders of that community whose influence extended even to the Jews in the Diaspora.³⁵ And though they did not admit the authority of the established high priesthood which functioned within the Jerusalem Sanhedrin, dissident sects such as that at Qumran still retained the pattern of a ruling group of elders for their own community.³⁶ All indications are that the early Christian communities that grew out of a basically Palestinian background found it natural to give a body of elders (presbyteroi) some power of guidance over local communities.

34. de Vaux, pp. 69-70

35. J. McKenzie, "Council," Dictionary of the Bible (London, 1965), pp. 152-53

36. Vermes, pp. 16-28

It should be noted that one finds in neither Old Testament texts nor in the New Testament writings any claim that this "office" of elder was of special divine institution - in opposition to the claims made for kingship, priesthood, and prophecy. Rather, the role of elders in Old Testament Israel seems to have resulted quite naturally from the intrinsic needs of the group, and to have been essentially judicial in nature.³⁷ In the early Christian churches neither the origin nor the exact function of the elders is clear, but the existence of such groups of guiding presbyteroi was apparently a common (if not universal) pattern. The presbyterate does not seem to have derived from the special corporate role of the Twelve at the beginnings of the Church, nor from the kind of special charism given the prophet or apostle. In Jerusalem it does seem that the presbyterate emerged only after the Twelve had gone on to other places; but even here there is no evidence that the presbyteroi were looked upon as successors of the Twelve in their pastoral role.

The quick emergence of established groups of presbyters seems to have resulted from the possession of natural leadership plus some form of community designation, though this latter did not have to take formal shape. In some cases the designation might have resulted from the actions of someone like Paul who as a "founding father" of a community would leave some members in charge.³⁸ In any event, it seems quite clear that the concrete needs of the Christian community dictated the existence of these Christian elders, and their precise function as contrasted with that of the Jewish

37. de Vaux, pp. 69-70

38. G. Bornkamm, "Presbyteros," TDNT, vol. 6, pp. 651-83

elders of the time was specified by the nature of Christianity as a new people grounded in faith in the risen Christ and entrusted with the prophetic preaching of the gospel.³⁹

Because of the special role which the bishop came to assume as teacher, it is important, finally, to look at the place of teachers in the New Testament writings.⁴⁰ Just as the role of elders seems to have arisen from the practical needs of the community, so, too, did the role of teacher.⁴¹ Given the kind of community that was formed in early Christianity, teaching in one form or another inevitably played a major part in that community's internal activity. Both in Judaism and in early Christianity there existed a group of recognized teachers distinct from either prophet or institutionalized priesthood, and in both instances the activity of

39. See von Campenhausen, pp. 76-123, for a careful discussion of "presbyter" in the New Testament and sub-apostolic writings. As he points out, it would be erroneous to see the presbyterate as an office; nor should one see "presbyter" as a precise function over against teaching or prophecy. There is evidence (both in the New Testament and in other first and second century writings) that presbyteros could overlap (or not overlap) with didaskalos or prophetes or episkopos, not in formal description of function but in the applicability of two (or more) of these terms to the same individual.

40. This issue is particularly pertinent in the Roman Catholic Church since the furor raised by Humanae Vitae and H. Kung's subsequent book, Infallible? (London, 1971).

41. One of the interesting features of these two "nonoffice" roles of elder and teacher is that the continuity between Israel and Christianity is here much stronger than with the classic priest-prophet-king roles. Moreover, the historical fact that the Judaism contemporary with the origin of Christianity was largely fashioned by teachers may help to explain why the early Christians did not feel keenly the need to set up a formally institutionalized priesthood.

such teachers was directed to unifying the people in faith.⁴² One of the clearest indications of the social dimension of their activity is the fact that these teachers, even though their "appointment" was based on their own understanding and/or training rather than on any official designation, were clearly intended to teach within an established tradition of belief.⁴³ The understanding that they were privileged to possess was not for their own sake but was a heritage to be passed on for the sake of the people.

Exactly how certain individuals came to exercise recognized authority in teaching is not clear; there is no "office" of teacher. There is a recognized role or function which is also seen as a special gift from the Spirit for the good of the community (I Cor. 14:26). It is easy enough to see how the persons who had been closely associated with Jesus would be recognized as particularly qualified to instruct others about his person, his deeds, and his teaching. So, also, there is evidence that the earliest converts in a given community then instructed others who were attracted to the gospel and baptized.⁴⁴ No doubt, some of the converts to Christianity were better educated and more equipped to grasp the nature and implications

42. There seems to be a body of evidence that some in the primitive Church were specially recognized (and to that extent designated) teachers. See K. Rengstorff, "Didaskalos," TDNT, vol. 2, pp. 157-59; also von Campenhausen, pp. 60-62. However, I am here using the term in a broader fashion, referring to the fact that some members of the early Church functioned in a recognized way as teachers in the community; this could apply to those mentioned as presbyteroi or episkopoi or apostoloi as well as to those denominated didaskaloi.

43. This is reflected even in Paul's view of his mission (I Cor. 11:23) or in the very existence of the Didache, which seems to have been a manual to guide travelling apostles so that their teaching would correspond to the traditions of Christian faith.

44. von Campenhausen, pp. 66-68

of the Christ-event, and so naturally would have been looked to as teachers. One group that fits this picture were the Jewish priests who embraced the gospel (Acts 6:7). Almost inevitably they would have received recognition from their fellow Christians, particularly in Jewish-Christian communities, as specially competent to understand and explain the gospel. Very likely they would have been prominent in the group leadership, the presbyteroi.

There is very little evidence of individuals being formally designated to teach. Acts describes the manner in which some, as Paul and Barnabas, were selected to go out as apostles (Acts 11:22-26; 13:1-3); perhaps the tenth chapter of Matthew (the mission of the disciples) reflects this same aspect of early Christianity. It seems clear that the major Christian communities, and particularly the "mother church" of Jerusalem, sent out emissaries to evangelize. Such apostles were engaged not only in the first preaching of the gospel and the establishment of a nucleus community but in the work of follow-up, in furthering teaching and encouragement, as Paul's letters testify.

One thing should be noted, for it will have important implications for a later understanding of episcopacy. The teaching about Christian life and its implications, though it inevitably touches upon "ethical" matters, is not an attempt to formulate an ethic; rather, it is exhortation and counsel to live out an ideal that is based in the death and resurrection of Jesus, an ideal of life that is the external expression of the Spirit's working within the community.⁴⁵ For this reason, the "minister" of such

45. R. Schnackenburg, The Moral Teaching of the New Testament (London, 1975), pp. 42-53

teaching would have to be gifted with authority that derived from more than the ability to articulate clear and distinct ideas. For one thing, it seems he would have to be able to say, as Paul did, "Be imitators of me, as I am of Christ" (I Cor. 11:1). The element of "good example" played an important part in early Christian teaching.

How early the function of teaching devolved upon the "governmental leadership" of the Christian communities is impossible to say. However, the Didache (15:1) indicates that episkopoi and diakonoι should be designated, so that they can function in the absence of prophets and teachers.⁴⁶ This would seem to say that the day-to-day task of instruction would have fallen to their lot. Again, in the Pastorals we see evidence that by the end of the first century the community leaders, the episkopoi, were responsible for the teaching of the community (I Tim. 3:2-3; 4:6-11). This is not to say that the involvement of episkopoi-presbyteroi in teaching was viewed as their function alone, or something that derived from their office in the community; it was rather a logical implication of their role in the community. It would be quite difficult to envisage a situation in which responsibility for the well-being of a faith community and leadership in that community would not include some form of teaching. As a matter of fact, in trying to reconstruct the evolution of ministry in early Christianity, it is difficult to say whether "teaching" began as a more or less independent function that was then progressively claimed by an emerging hierarchy, or whether it was first seen informally as pertaining to

46. This is to accept the thesis of some scholars that the Didache predates A.D. 100. See R. Grant, The Apostolic Fathers (New York, 1964), vol. 1, p. 75.

the episkopoi and only "delegated" by them to others as the communities became larger and more complex.

One important piece of evidence in this matter must be the development of first century thought and imagery about Peter. Without reading back notions of "primacy" into the biblical writings, it does seem that Peter is depicted as an ideal for those in positions of responsibility in the early communities. Consequently, it is significant to note that by the time the New Testament was completed the symbolic function of Peter (regardless of his actual historical activity) included witness, shepherding, and safeguarding accuracy of faith. But it also seems significant that such Petrine functions are linked to his being a privileged recipient of revelation, rather than to any special governing position he occupied in the early community.⁴⁷

Finally, there is nothing that would point clearly to an official group entrusted with the instruction that would have been part of Christian initiation. The evidence of New Testament texts is varied: it is the deacon Philip who functions in this regard for the emissary of the queen of Ethiopia (Acts 8:26-39); Paul's epistles are in many portions an explanation of the baptism which the faithful had received, a clarification of the implications of that entry into Christ (Rom. 6:3-11), and an exhortation to live out faithfully the commitment of baptism (Gal. 3:23ff.). For that reason they may point to a special apostolic role in initiating people into the community, though it is interesting to notice that Paul lays no claim

47. See the study Peter in the New Testament, ed. Brown, Donfried, Reumann (Minneapolis, 1973), pp. 157-68, where the notion of trajectory is used to describe the early Christian evolution of understanding about Peter.

to the right to baptize (I Cor. 1:14-17). The attribution of the two Petrine epistles to Peter, and the fact that they are considered by some authorities to be a catechesis bearing on baptism, may indicate some tendency to see baptismal instruction as the proper responsibility of the leader of the community.⁴⁸

Having examined the New Testament evidence for its understanding of the types and forms of ministry, we must now pass through the "tunnel period" (roughly A.D. 90 to 150) to discover what clues are there to help us discern the developing office of bishop, and finally, by the light at the end of the tunnel, we can examine what emerged as essentially the finished product for the next thousand years.

B. The Catholic Development

1. The Second and Third Centuries

As it came into increasing contact with secular society, the Church of the first three centuries could not but be subject to forces of great social evolution.¹ But perhaps even more important than the forces which played upon it from the outside was the fact that the human community which was the Church was still in its early stages of self-discovery and self-establishment. Christians were still in the process of adjusting their eschatologically and charismatically oriented faith to the exigencies of human history and to the task of bringing salvation to men in the concrete framework of that history.

48. F. Beare, The First Epistle of Peter (Oxford, 1970), pp. 220-26; and J. Elliott, The Elect and the Holy (Leiden, 1966), pp. 12-13

1. K. Latourette, A History of the Expansion of Christianity, vol. 1 (London, 1938), pp. 298-362

What was the role of Christianity to be in this continuing historical existence? Obviously, Christians were to preach the gospel and live it out in their daily activity, but what forms should this take as they found themselves confronted by a broad spectrum of cultural and social groupings? And as the activities of Christians took on new forms to meet the changing context, what forms should the community itself adopt as a social entity? It is not surprising to see radical mutations in the social structures of Christianity between the time of the early Pauline epistles and that of Cyprian or Origen. What is surprising is that there was, despite the multiplicity of forces affecting the Church, the amount of social continuity that is demonstrated by the historical evidence.² There was a clear line of identity, but this is far from the naive picture that sees all the social structures of Christianity as coming ready-made from some historical action of Jesus himself;³ instead, early Christianity saw the abiding activity of the risen Christ through his Spirit as providing continuity for the Church as it goes through historical change.⁴

By the time of the Pastoral epistles we begin to find evidence that the separate community organizations of the apostolic period were beginning to be merged into a single structure.⁵ Drawn, as we saw in the last section, from the heritage of Judaism, the presbyterate seems to have been a prominent agency for directing and nurturing the life of the early com-

2. Latourette, p. 362

3. I have in mind here the oversimplified use of "instituted by Christ" as applied to the Church or its institutions.

4. J.D.G. Dunn, Jesus and the Spirit (London, 1975), pp. 350-51

5. E. Schweizer, Church Order in the New Testament (London, 1961), pp. 83-86

munities, particularly those which more directly owed their origins to Jewish Christianity.⁶ In these communities in their first decades of existence the governance of the teaching, liturgy, and shared social life of the group was entrusted for the most part to a group of "elders."⁷ These were not necessarily the oldest members of the community,⁸ but rather those who had some credentials, such as age or experience, association with the original disciples of Jesus, or being the first converts to Christianity in the group, which indicated a right to leadership. If and when an apostle or a recognized prophet visited the community, he exercised a superior but transitory authority.⁹ However, the ordinary day-by-day direction of the community's Christian life rested with the corporate leadership of the presbyterate.

Another pattern, which seems to have become common in the Hellenistic communities, was that of providing an episkopos, or overseer, whether by the appointment of the founding apostle or selection by the community it is impossible to say.¹⁰ Associated with these episkopoi, but subject to

6. von Campenhausen, pp. 76-123; Daniélou, pp. 83-86

7. This is the pattern in Jerusalem, most likely also in Rome where Hermas attests to the important role of presbyteroi in the early second century (and the earlier letter of Ignatius to the Romans had made no mention of the episkopos). While there is no mention of presbyteroi in Paul's letters to the Corinthians, the letter of Clement to the Corinthians presupposes the established institution of presbyteroi.

8. L. Goppelt, Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Times (London, 1970), pp. 185-86

9. See Daniélou, p. 356. The Didache also attests to the special credentials and authority of the visiting apostle, but the residential group that functions in the normal circumstances is not described as presbyteroi but as episkopoi and diakonoí (15:1-2).

10. For contrasting views, see Dunn, pp. 291-99, and Schweizer, pp. 89-104.

them, were the diakonoi, appointed to help carry out such aspects of community care as providing for the poor or assisting in worship.¹¹

As convergence of these patterns began, episkopoi did not replace the presbyters but worked along with them. Very likely the chief leader of the community was picked from the presbyterate and in many instances even selected by it. The impression one gets is that the presbyters acted as a corporate counseling, or even judicial, body; but the executive role of directing the community rested with the episkopos assisted by the deacons.¹²

These elements rapidly developed into the tripartite structure which is indicated in the Pastorals, sharply described in the Ignatian letters, and firmly established throughout the Church by the end of the second century.¹³ Yet it would be an anachronism to see the bishop-presbyter-deacon pattern as three levels of one pastoral office, with the bishop possessing the totality and delegating much of it to presbyters and somewhat less to deacons. For the most part, the situation in the early

11. Prior to the Pastorals there is no Pauline clarification of the function or status of diakonia, though the linking of episkopoi and diakonoi in the opening lines of Philippians would suggest the episcopal-assistant role. Though the origins of the diaconate are not clear (Acts cannot be appealed to as evidence, except with careful qualification; see Schweizer, pp. 70-71), all the early testimony indicates their activity in works of mercy and as liturgical assistants. See I Clem. 40:2-5; Hermas, Pastor, Vis. 3.5.1; Ignatius, Phil. 4; Magn. 6.

12. See Goppelt, pp. 187-91; Schweizer, pp. 198-203; von Campenhausen, pp. 76-103. The divergence among these scholars indicates the impossibility of arriving at definitive conclusions about the early Christian situation of ministry.

13. I Tim. 3-5; Magn. 6:1; Tertullian, Concerning Baptism 17

churches seems to have been one in which it was the deacons who were related most closely to the bishops and totally dependent upon him for their authority;¹⁴ whereas the presbyters, though receiving some of their functions (particularly in liturgy) by delegation from the bishop, retained a certain autonomy in setting policy for the life of the community.¹⁵ While the precise office exercised by episkopoi only gradually came to be defined, it seems that from the beginning they were looked upon as "officials" (as were deacons in their own way), whereas the presbyters were not.¹⁶ At least, that was the situation well into the second century.¹⁷

At the same time that this coalescence of originally distinct patterns of polity was occurring, there was a second merging of "offices" within early Christianity: that of itinerant and residential ministries. In the early decades, traveling apostles and prophets were largely instrumental in founding Christian communities and in nourishing their faith. The Dida-che bears witness to the eminent position of such visiting leaders, to their role in worship and teaching (10:7), but also testifies to the need to pass some judgment on the authority and honor claimed by such men (11:8-10). As the local churches became more stable, they increasingly provided

14. Thus, in the ordination ceremony of Hippolytus' Apostolic Tradition, the deacon is "ordained for the service of the bishop" (9:2), and the Didas-calia details the fashion in which the deacon serves as the bishop's immediate assistant.

15. K. Latourette, A History of Christianity (London, n.d.), pp. 116-17

16. It is worth observing that although episkopoi only appear in Philipppians, Paul's letters to the Corinthians provide background for such an office in his mention of administrators (I Cor. 12:28), in his exhortation to be subject to the first converts (I Cor. 16:15-16), and for the obvious reverence he expects to be paid to his representatives (II Cor. 8:16-24).

17. Though Hermas mentions the prominent position of the presbyteroi in the community (Vis. 2.4.2), presbyters are not included in the listing of offices in Vis. 3.5.1.

and depended upon members of their own community, not only upon episkopoi and the presbyters but also upon others who acted as teachers and prophets. One thinks, for example, of the role played by Hermas in the second century Roman community. However, the influence of visiting teachers and prophets did not completely fade out of the picture; the role exercised by Origen in the third century shows this quite clearly. By this time, though, such teaching was considered proper to members of the clergy,¹⁸ and the clergy were under the authority of the monarchical episcopate.¹⁹

Not only did the itinerant ministry tend to vanish as its functions became unnecessary or were absorbed by resident ministers, but also the "offices" of prophet and teacher, originally quite distinct from the episkopos-presbyteros-diakonos structure, were increasingly taken over by the episcopacy.²⁰ Again, the process is not total, for both teachers and prophets are in evidence well beyond Nicaea. Yet the third century provides no examples of prophets with the influence and autonomy of Hermas, nor of teachers with the independent status of Clement of Alexandria.²¹ Already, at the beginning of the second century, Ignatius laid claim to prophetic endowment for the bishop in the performance of his role,²² and one finds the same claim being made by as administratively oriented a bishop as Cyprian

18. von Campenhausen, pp. 238-64

19. This is quite clear from the synodal activity of the bishops, which was already well established in portions of the Church by the beginning of the third century. See T.A. Lacey, ed., Select Epistles of St. Cyprian (London, n.d.), p. ix.

20. Grant, pp. 172-73

21. Even Origen, despite his international recognition, was fitted into the clerical structures.

22. Phil. 7; Trall. 4-6

in the third century.²³ And the Didascalia indicates that at least in the Syrian church of the third century the episcopacy had laid quite exclusive claim to the office of authoritative teaching.²⁴

By the end of the pre-Nicene period, the episcopacy had clearly taken over full authority for the direction of church life. They did not personally exercise all the roles, but official authority in the Church was seen to be vested in them; theirs was the special divine guidance that safeguards the faith and effectiveness of the Church; they were the ones from whom came, by way of delegation, whatever responsibility and authority was exercised by others.²⁵ Governance of church life, even in its most spiritual aspects, was by Nicaea the almost total preserve of a distinct group, the clergy which found its focus and source of power in the episcopacy.

One could view the increasing possession of authority by the early episcopacy as a manifestation of that tendency to seize increasing power which is so often characteristic of those in official position. While it would be naive to exclude all such human weakness from the bishops of the early Church (and certainly men like Tertullian were not loath to level such accusations!), the historical evidence points rather to such increased power being a response to the needs of an expanding Christianity.²⁶

In the earliest stages of its existence, the Church, consisting as it did of relatively small and closely knit communities, could depend on

23. De Unitate Ecclesiae 11

24. chapters 8 and 11

25. See Cyprian, Letters 66:6 and 33:1.

26. Thus Cyprian's insistence that the bishop (and also the presbyter and deacon) exists for the sake of the community; see von Campenhausen, pp. 268-69.

strongly personal and charismatic direction. This could, and generally did, provide for safeguarding the accuracy and growth of faith and for nurturing unity based on love. Within a short time, however, the rapid growth of Christianity and its increased contact with gnostic and other elements in the surrounding culture set up new demands. Even the New Testament literature indicates the tensions and differences of view that arose as Christians attempted to understand in more detail the content and implications of the revelation that had come in the Christ-event.²⁷ In that situation of the primitive Church, the Twelve or those closely associated with them could resolve many of the problems. But such a solution could not last beyond the end of the first century; provision had to be made by those who bore responsibility for the churches.

All the evidence points to the concerted effort of those in authority to preserve unity within each community and between the communities. Beginning with Paul, the moral catechesis and exhortation given the churches stresses the evil of dissension and disruption.²⁸ This clearly reflects the manner in which the leadership of the early Church saw itself charged with the task of preserving this unity of the one Body of Christ. And since the two great threats to this unity were erroneous teaching and sinfulness in Christian life, it was inevitable that the episcopacy increasingly concerned itself with maintaining unity of belief and purity of life.

27. The Pauline-Petrine tension reflected in Acts 15 is perhaps the best example of a disagreement that had long-range implications for the Church.

28. Thus the concern for unity is found in the earliest Pauline letters (e.g., to the Corinthians), in the "body of Christ" teaching in Ephesians, and in the exhortations of the Pastorals; and I Clem. and Ignatius' letters bear witness to the continuance of this concern into the second century.

Rather than demonstrating a selfish quest for power and influence, this development testifies to the manner in which the early episcopacy measured its responsibilities and established its identity of office in terms of the needs of the Church.

Though the exact nature of the procedure during the first two centuries is unclear, there is definite evidence that from the very beginning Christian communities both excommunicated and reconciled gravely sinful members. New Testament literature attests to the origins of this Christian claim to deal with grave sin, a claim that is grounded in Christ's granting of the power to "bind or loose."²⁹ By the time of Tertullian, the decisive activity in such cases had clearly resided with the episcopacy for some years,³⁰ and the bishops' assertion of the right both to exclude and to reconcile sinners was justified by the developing doctrine of apostolic succession.³¹ However, the practical process of dealing with the reconciliation of sinners, reflecting in their regard the mercy of Christ, without at the same time endangering the spiritual idealism of the Church by moral laxity, seems to have done more to shape penitential discipline than any theological speculation on the episcopal office.³² Theological discussion there was, on the effect of grave sin and on the "power of the keys," but insofar as this influenced episcopal exercise of authority it seems to have been a case of the theology being

29. Matt. 16:18; 18:18; John 20:23. Of these texts, Matt. 16:18 became the most utilized text in patristic writings about penitential reconciliation.

30. Even his Montanist attack upon episcopal power to forgive sin testifies to the established practice of his day.

31. von Campenhausen, pp. 235-37

32. This is particularly clear in Cyprian's adjustment to the specific needs of the situation he encountered; see Letter 55:2.

a justification for practical judgment already made rather than speculative grounds for decisions yet to be made.³³

Several factors demanded increased organization of and control over the process of teaching. Large numbers of converts to Christianity confronted the Church with the need of providing a careful process of catechumenate preparation for baptism and a continuing catechesis. This need became painfully evident at times of large-scale defection, as in the Decian persecution. And while the task now exceeded the possibility of the bishop's handling it personally, the supervision of such educational programs became clearly the responsibility of the bishop.³⁴ He watched over the formation of the catechumens. It was primarily his function, as Justin already indicated in the middle of the second century, to form the community's understanding through the Eucharistic homily.³⁵ Throughout the pre-Nicene period there were teachers who functioned probably with some approbation of the community and its episcopal leadership, but not precisely as delegates of the bishop.³⁶ Yet by the third century the principle seems quite well established that instruction regarding the faith is reserved to the clergy, and therefore under the bishop's guidance.³⁷

As we move into the sub-apostolic period we still find a striking absence of cultic language to refer to worship actions or leadership personnel. Even the final (and more "Catholic") portions of the New Testament,

33. von Campenhausen, pp. 284-92

34. This is the situation reflected in the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus at the beginning of the third century.

35. Apology 1:67. This is assuming that one can identify the regular president of the Eucharistic assembly with the episkopos.

36. G. Dix, ed., The Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition (London, 1937), p. xxvii

37. von Campenhausen, pp. 238-64

though they tend to reflect the emergence of a monarchical episcopate, do not reflect any tendency to look upon the leadership of the Christian communities as hieratic. By the end of the second century, however, there are clear evidences that "hiereus" is being applied in the Greek-speaking churches and "sacerdos" in the Latin-speaking churches.³⁸

These terms are applied to Christ himself, to Christian episkopoi and presbyteroi, to the Christian people, and used frequently in referring back to the Old Testament priesthood. Thus, the second century seems to have witnessed a startling shift from the New Testament mentality and in the direction of cult categories, an evolution that is accelerated in the third century.

One finds very early use of hiereus (more often of archiereus) in reference to Christ. We might expect this in the area of the early Church to which the Epistle to the Hebrews was directed; but we find it also in the letter of Clement of Rome and in Justin.³⁹ Somewhat surprisingly, because the general tone of his letters is quite liturgical, Ignatius of Antioch does not refer to Christ as high priest; but from the same part of the Church, in the hymn placed on the lips of Polycarp in the account of his martyrdom, Christ is called the "eternal and heavenly high priest."⁴⁰ Again, the early testimony of the Didache reflects no application of hiereus to Christ; even in its liturgical prayers the term applied to Christ is "Servant" (10:1-4).

In the Apostolic Tradition, from the third century, the liturgical

38. H. Küng, Why Priests? (London, 1972), pp. 37-38

39. I Clem. 61:3; Trypho 42, 116

40. Martyrdom of Polycarp 14; this testimony is slightly later (A.D. 156) than the Ignatian epistles.

prayers for the ceremony of ordination do not contain an explicit denomination of Christ as archiereus, but they say it by way of implication in speaking of the "high-priestly Spirit" and of Christ pouring out this Spirit on his disciples.⁴¹ In the mid-third century, Origen's Concerning Prayer presents Christ, the high priest, as the model of Christian prayer (15:4). Towards the end of the century, Cyprian speaks of Christ as the principal priest, links this with Christian celebration of the Eucharist, and presents Christ as the model of Christian priests.⁴² But perhaps the most important evidence of the pre-Nicene period is that contained in the Didascalia, probably late third century.⁴³ Here the idea of priesthood is central, its application to the episcopacy explicit and extended; its framework of reference is not noticeably that of Christ's priesthood. Christ is scarcely mentioned as high priest; instead, the antecedent of Christian priesthood from which the argumentation is drawn is the priesthood of the Old Testament.⁴⁴ This raises the question: What was it that underlay increased emphasis on the cultic aspects of Christian episcopacy and presbyterate, reflection on the priesthood of Christ or reintroduction of Old Testament categories?⁴⁵ In either case, quite clearly, by late third century hiereus/sacerdos was a well-established denomination of the episcopacy.

41. Apostolic Tradition 3

42. Letter 63:14

43. On the dating and provenance of the Didascalia, see R. Connolly, Didascalia Apostolorum (Oxford, 1929), pp. lxxxvii - xci.

44. Especially in chapters 8 and 9.

45. Paralleling of Christian presbyteroi and episkopoi to the Old Testament priesthood is as early as I Clem. 40, but the purpose of this Clementine passage is not to clarify the nature of Christian ministry by comparing it with Old Testament priesthood, but simply to indicate the divine appointment of Christian ministers.

When we move back into the second century, the evidence for use of the term hiereus for the episkopoi seems to be completely missing. Ignatius, who speaks clearly about the function of the bishop, and includes in that function a role of leadership in Christian initiation and Eucharist, does not use hiereus of the bishop or parallel his role to that of the Old Testament high priest. Justin applies hiereus both to Christ and to the Christian community, but not to the episkopos (Trypho 116). Nor do we find any application of the term to episkopoi (or for that matter to presbyteroi) in Hermas, the Apologetes, Clement of Rome, or any other second century writer.⁴⁶

One must be careful not to draw conclusions too hastily from this absence of hieratic terminology in the second century. First of all, it is dangerous to draw a negative conclusion from the limited second century texts we have. Secondly, the liturgical texts in Hippolytus may reflect Roman (and perhaps much broader) usage and thinking from as early as mid-second century. Yet, in the light of what seems a determined effort on the part of the New Testament writers to avoid application of hiereus to the ministry of the Christian community, the second century seems to have retained this same reluctance for quite some time. Use of hiereus to designate the presbyterate or its function is almost totally lacking, not just in the second century but in the entire ante-Nicene period. And this is despite clear evidence that presbyters functioned along with the bishop

46. With the possible exception of I Clem. 40, cited above. See H. Chadwick, "Episcopacy in the New Testament and Early Church," in Today's Church and Today's World (London, 1977), p. 212, and Küng, p. 37.

(or as his substitutes) in Eucharistic and other liturgical actions.⁴⁷

The sole exception to this absence of evidence (but it is an exception of major importance) is the statement in the Apostolic Tradition where, in explaining why only the bishop imposes hands in diaconal ordination, it states that the deacon is not being ordained to the priesthood, but to the service of the bishop.⁴⁸ There are also indications, both in the Didascalia and in Cyprian, that the presbyters share in the sacerdotium with the bishop, but the term "priest" is not explicitly applied to them.

Apart from theological understandings they may (or may not) have had of priesthood and worship, the early Christian communities quickly developed a number of flexibly ritualized actions which were identifiably similar from one community to another.⁴⁹ Most important of these were the Eucharist, baptismal initiation, the "laying on of hands" for ministerial ordination, and, as it came into existence a bit later, the ceremonies of the exomologesis or reconciliation of penitents. Since by sometime in the second century there was universal recognition that presidency over such ritual acts was part of the function attached to those called "priests," it is necessary to examine more carefully the exercise of such liturgical leadership.

Not that other evidence is without value (such as some of the indirect references in Hermas⁵⁰), nor that further evolution did not occur in the third century, but it does seem that the essential development can be

47. This is already indicated in Ignatius of Antioch and clearly stated in Hippolytus, Cyprian, and the Didascalia.

48. A.T. 9, "...non in sacerdotio ordinatur, sed in ministerio episcopi..."

49. J. Jungmann, The Mass of the Roman Rite (London, 1961), pp. 3-22

50. Vis. 2:4; Simil. 25-27

clarified by examining the Didache, Ignatius, Justin, and Hippolytus.

In the Didache, presiding over the "breaking of the bread" seems to be the prerogative of the apostles and prophets, and in their absence (which was probably the more common situation) the prerogative of the episkopoi chosen by the community (10, 15). In Ignatius of Antioch the leadership (even the control) of the ritual actions of the Eucharist and baptism is firmly in the hands of the bishop, though others join him in the Eucharistic celebration and some may even act as celebrants by his authorization (Smyrn. 8:1-2). That the pattern of monarchical episcopal direction of sacramental ritual is clearly indicated in Ignatius' letters is not the question. The question is the extent to which such a pattern prevailed at this time (apparently, to most of the churches to whom he addressed letters, the remarkable exception being Rome), and the reasons for this quick emergence of tripartite ministry.

Appeal to the testimony of Justin is controlled by the disputed passage where he speaks of ho proestos, the "president" of the Eucharistic assembly (I Apology 62, 67). While no completely convincing explanation of the usage will probably ever be given, the arguments used by Jalland and by Bernard seem to point quite strongly to an identity of the proestos with the episkopos.⁵¹ If so, the episcopal role claimed in the Ignatian letters is described in greater detail by Justin. It is he who explains the meaning and implications of the day's readings; it is he who prays the Eucharistic prayer over the gifts which are thereby changed into the

51. T. Jalland, "Justin Martyr and the President of the Eucharist," Studia Patristica, V (1962), pp. 83-85; L. Bernard, Justin Martyr: His Life and Thought (Cambridge, 1967), p. 133

body of Christ.

In Hippolytus the picture is quite clear. The two detailed descriptions of liturgical ritual (the ordination rite and the initiation ceremony) give us, through the prayers for episcopal and presbyteral ordination, an invaluable insight into the understanding of those two offices and, through the description of the rite of initiation, a view of the episcopal celebrant in action (3-10, 22-23). There is no question about the presidency at both ceremonies. We can argue from them to the ordinary celebrations of the Eucharist: the regular celebrant is the bishop who is accompanied by the presbyterate and assisted by the deacons. Allowing for the need, as numbers of Christians grew, to have outlying Eucharistic celebration under the delegated leadership of presbyters, the normative liturgy had the bishop as celebrant. Having said this, we must be careful not to read too monarchic a view of episcopacy into the situation. There are two possible ways of explaining the situation described by Hippolytus and in other third century documents: one can say that the bishop is celebrant and assisted by the presbyterate, or one can say that the presbyterate is celebrant under the presidency of its chosen bishop. The Apostolic Tradition does not demand either explanation.

While "ministry" is essentially a functional reality, and various types of ministry are distinguished by the different functions performed, "priesthood" resists such classification. It is more a state of being, a level of existence, although there is a danger in imposing even these notions on Christian priesthood, for they may prove to be nonappropriate categories. There is no doubt, though, that the notion of "priesthood"

has always had overtones of dedication, of being set apart, whether the term was used of the whole Christian people or of some more restricted group.

Clearly the action most commonly referred to in the early Christian centuries as cheirotone^a, "imposition of hands," was some sort of special designation; it singled out the ordained for particular function but also some special dignity within the community (I Tim. 5:17). Evidence for the existence of some such act of designating episkopoi and presbyteroi is as old as the Pastorals, but there is no indication of the nature of the ceremony prior to the Apostolic Tradition.⁵² There we have a rich source of insight, for the basic action is described and the accompanying prayers contain insights into the meaning of the ceremony.⁵³

Combining the evidence from this ordination ceremonial, which seems to have been typical of what took place from mid-second century through the ante-Nicene period, with other fragments of information, we can suggest several conclusions. The imposition of hands for episcopacy was strictly the action of the episcopacy, one or preferably more bishops. In presbyteral ordination, the imposition of hands involved the whole presbyterate, but the bishop's imposition of hands seems quite clearly to have had special significance.⁵⁴ In both instances, there was the idea of acceptance into a collegial reality, into the episcopacy or into the presbyterate.⁵⁵

52. Acts 6:1-6; I Tim. 4:14; 5:22; II Tim. 1:6

53. We will take a closer look at the evidence afforded by three of the earliest consecration prayers in part 3 of this section.

54. In A.T. 8 it is the bishop's imposition of the hand on the presbyteral ordinand that is mentioned first, and it is the bishop alone who pronounces the accompanying prayer.

55. See Cyprian, Letters 41, 43.

In both, the imposition of hands is associated with the giving of the Spirit.⁵⁶ In both ordinations the action is consummated in the collegial celebration of the Eucharist, which seems quite definitely to accentuate the cultic orientation of the role or function which results from ordination. There is one interesting question that occurs with respect to presbyteral ordination. It arises from a remark in the Apostolic Tradition that no ordination to presbyterate is required for a person who has already witnessed to the faith in persecution.⁵⁷ This gives us an important element of understanding: Ordination was seen as recognition of action of the Spirit already present in the ordinand, rather than as simple human choice which the Spirit would ratify. Ordination would not, then, be expected to infuse the qualifications desired in bishop or presbyter.⁵⁸

In any event, it seems that bishops and presbyters, in a way that was not shared by the deacons, formed a sacral group within the Church. They had functions reserved to them, at least from fairly early in the second century, but they also had a position of dignity and prestige that

56. A.T. 3-4, 8. What is not clear is the extent to which the imposition of hands and accompanying prayer were viewed as a petition to God to grant the Spirit or as a collegial sharing of the Spirit; both elements seem to be present.

57. 10. "If a confessor has been in chains in prison for the Name, hands are not laid on him for the diaconate or the presbyterate; for he has the dignity of the presbyterate by his confession."

58. As one reflects on this, it becomes clear that the position of martyrdom as the ultimate expression of Christian life made for a radical egalitarianism in early Christianity. It is possible to see how this witness of martyrdom, open to all and even demanded of them when persecution confronted them, tended to limit or even challenge the kind of authority attached to officials within the early Church. Probably the classic case was the struggle between Cyprian and the confessors in the Carthaginian assembly. See S. Greenslade, ed., Early Latin Theology (London, 1956), pp. 114-15.

had to do with special association with the divine. And this was allied with the authority increasingly possessed by the bishop.

2. The Fourth and Fifth Centuries

In many ways the fourth and fifth centuries, despite the bitter controversy with which they were marked, were the golden age of the episcopacy. Emerging from the period of persecution as the unquestioned leaders of the Christian communities, grounding this leadership in the ideas developed by Cyprian and Irenaeus and the Didascalia, the bishops of that period clearly dominated the life of the Church, and immensely enriched its intellectual heritage.

This was a period of rapid and basic evolution in the social existence of the Church. The Edict of Milan had created a new context for Christian existence; large scale conversion introduced greater complexity into Church organization; increasing absorption of cultural traditions and forms brought with it a pluralism of religious and theological expressions of the gospel - a source of enrichment but also a danger to Christian unity. Prominent as it was, the episcopacy found itself at the very center of this change.

To quite an extent the Christian communities of the first couple of centuries had existed as islands in the midst of a cultural and political world that was at first oblivious and then alternately indifferent and hostile to Christianity. With the reign of Constantine, all this changed rapidly. Although with brief reversals (such as the reign of Julian), the Christian Church passed from rejection to official toleration, and

from toleration to involvement. Almost immediately, bishops found themselves in the position of part-time functionaries in the civil sphere. There were the special assignments given by the emperor to bishops because of their prominence and acknowledged ability and influence.⁵⁹ There were also the regular functions, such as presiding over episcopal courts which then had received full civil recognition.⁶⁰ Moreover, with the rapid growth of the Church, ecclesiastical activities and disputes began to have a noticeable impact on the well-being of the civil society; consequently, civil authorities worked increasingly with the bishops to guarantee tranquility within the Church.⁶¹ And increasingly the relation between the Church and civil society came to the fore as a theological question.⁶²

One of the most striking features of the fourth and fifth centuries is the extent to which the episcopacy was prepared to move aggressively into the post-Nicene situation and exploit its opportunities. In so doing, the episcopacy realized its potential as it had not been able to previously, but this development was in continuity with the preceding two centuries. The same cannot be said for the presbyterate. Increasingly it lost the relative independence and initiative it had possessed, it lost its role as chief council for the Church and the bishop (except for some residue in its part in electing a bishop), and it lost its corporate iden-

59. E.g., Valentinian II's use of Ambrose in negotiations with Maximus, "the first employment of a bishop on a secular diplomatic mission," according to Greenslade, pp. 218-25.

60. E. Pickman, The Mind of Latin Christendom (London, 1937), pp. 259-62

61. Perhaps the most prominent early instance of this was Constantine's role in convoking the Council of Nicea. See W. Walker, A History of the Christian Church (Edinburgh, 1922), pp. 116-17.

62. Greenslade, pp. 178-81, 190-217, 226-58

tity and function (except in large cities in solemn liturgical functions). Instead, presbyters were ordained as helpers for the bishop (what was previously true of the deacons in the Apostolic Tradition). They tended increasingly to be given individual assignments as "little bishops" caring for branch communities, and became part of the bishop's charge and "burden," rather than fellow members who selected him to head their "college."⁶³

Unquestionably, the presbyterate was overshadowed by the episcopacy during these two centuries. One reason for this was, quite simply, the fact that there were many great bishops. They were gifted men, many of them well-educated, quite a number endowed with considerable natural leadership, some possessed a high degree of Christian sanctity. Not unimportantly, many of them were politically powerful both within the workings of the Church (which was becoming rapidly politicized in its operations) and with the civil rulers. In several instances, Ambrose in Milan is a classic example, bishops wielded power and influence far beyond what flowed intrinsically from their episcopal authority. It would be a mistake, however, to see this as a move by the bishops into the realm of civil politics and temporal power. Some of this there was, and generally for the sake of protecting Christians from oppression or exploitation, but for the most part it was a question of the extraordinary moral power exerted by these men upon their contemporaries.⁶⁴

To a surprising degree, the bishops of this period, despite their expanding involvement in various types of administration, retained the pri-

63. H.R. Niebuhr and D.D. Williams, ed., The Ministry in Historical Perspectives (New York, 1956), pp. 56-59

64. Pickman, pp. 229-313

macy of preaching in their ministry. Not only did bishops preach, but they insisted that it was their special prerogative to preach. If presbyters preached it was by way of delegation or appointment from the bishop, as with Chrysostom in Antioch.⁶⁵

The responsibility of teaching was seen to flow from two principles: (1) as successors of the apostles and entrusted with the tradition that comes from them, it is the bishops above all who are charged with preaching that gospel to the world; and (2) as shepherds of their people, they must care for them and "not hesitate to lay down their lives in order to give them the gospel."⁶⁶

Apparently, the bishops of these two centuries considered the pursuit of theology to be an intrinsic part of the episcopal function. It is not clear whether they thought of theology as officially reserved to them (and perhaps delegated to others under their guidance), or whether they thought they were to function normatively in theological investigation. Unquestionably the bishops of this period saw themselves corporately charged with preserving orthodoxy of belief and therefore with opposing any misleading or false explanations of the Christian faith. Thus, while they did not formally develop any theory of their role in the theological enterprise, in actuality their synodal and conciliar judgments did regulate the course of theological speculation.⁶⁷

Few periods in the Church's history can challenge the fourth and fifth centuries so far as theological and doctrinal ferment is concerned. With

65. J. Wordsworth, The Ministry of Grace (London, 1901), pp. 163-65

66. Basil, The Morals 80:16

67. Walker, pp. 143-53

the great councils of Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon as focal points, much of the Church was embroiled in bitter and divisive polemics about the doctrines of God, Christ, grace, and sin. And in this period of astonishing theological debate and development, practically all the outstanding theologians were bishops. And the coincidence of theologian with bishop was not accidental: functioning as theologians was seen by such bishops as Augustine, Hilary or Chrysostom as a necessary part of their episcopal office. How else could they preserve their flock from the contagion of error?

If these two centuries were the period of great individual bishops, it was also a period of greatly increased corporate activity of the episcopacy. Alongside the four great councils, themselves preceded and followed by a number of smaller synodal meetings in various parts of the Church, there developed a regular pattern of regional synodal meetings.⁶⁸ While the need to deal with suspected doctrinal aberrations played a large part in many of these meetings, they were also concerned with the basic governance of the Church's life and issued regulations concerning such items as clerical behavior, liturgy, and church property. The disciplinary canons of these synods provide us with one of our most valuable witnesses to ecclesiastical life and structure, because they played such a basic role in the governance of the Church. They were not only the equivalent but actually the beginnings of canon law.⁶⁹

68. We know from the Cyprianic epistles, for example, that the African bishops were by 250 in the custom of meeting annually after the Paschal celebration.

69. "Canon Law, History of," in Catholic Encyclopedia (New York, 1967), vol. 3, pp. 34-37

Thus, despite the individual eminence of so many bishops of this period, the increasing pattern of regional synods indicates the extent to which the collegial nature of the episcopacy was appreciated. In the fourth and fifth centuries there was still great local insistence on the prerogatives of the local church and its bishop, but there was also a strong awareness of the catholic Church and of the corporate unity of its priesthood.

It is interesting to notice that this period, which saw the bishops increasingly caught up in administration and increasingly acting "officially," also saw a rapid crystallization of their ceremonial role in Christian liturgy.⁷⁰ The name sacerdos was applied to them frequently and properly; there are enough texts to indicate that the sacerdotium was seen to extend to lower clergy (at least to the presbyters),⁷¹ but the view of the bishop as the priest was so widespread that one can take for granted in texts of this period that sacerdos (when used without further qualification) is referring to the bishop.

What is much less clear is the mentality that lies behind this denomination of the bishops. Apparently there was a considerable shift in view from the first two centuries, when there seems to have been reluctance to use hiereus or sacerdos of Christian ministers. There seems little doubt that fourth and fifth century use of sacerdos had primarily

70. Not that there is any substantial change from their liturgical activity in the preceding century, but this is the period when many of the basic liturgies were formulated.

71. Optatus (1:13) in North Africa applies the dignitas officii sacerdotalis to both presbyters and deacons. The application to the deacons is a bit unexpected. (Hippolytus' Apostolic Tradition had explicitly excluded the deacons from the sacerdotium); it may reflect the increasing power of the deacons, against which Jerome and others protested.

in mind the ritual function of the bishop in the Eucharist, secondarily his role in the other sacraments.⁷² He was the leitourgos, and in the post-Constantinian movement of Eucharistic liturgy into larger and more splendid quarters the ceremonial role of the bishop became more observable.⁷³ Like the high priest of the old Jerusalem Temple he offered "a clean oblation" in a new temple situation; it is not surprising to see more and more comparisons of the Old Testament high priests to the bishops (and other Old Testament priests to Christian presbyters).⁷⁴ Yet, the priesthood possessed by Christian clergy is that of Christ, a priesthood "according to the order of Melchizedek." While in this period only Christ and not the ordained Christian minister is paralleled with Melchizedek, the overtones touch the bishop whose priesthood is a share in that of Christ.⁷⁵

What is true of sacerdos as applied to the bishop extends, mutatis mutandis, to the role of presbyters and deacons in the sacramental liturgies. With Eucharistic concelebration the basic pattern in all the larger communities, with the presbyterate sharing in the imposition of hands for

72. Typically, Chrysostom speaks of the power of the priest who can beget men to new life (On the Priesthood 3:5), who can help ward off greater evil by imposing penance (3:6). But the priest's loftiest dignity is connected with his Eucharistic role: "But when he invokes the Holy Spirit and offers that awful sacrifice and keeps on touching the common Master of us all, tell me, where shall we rank him? What purity and what piety shall we demand of him? ...Ought anyone to have a purer and holier soul than one who is to welcome this great Spirit?" (6:4). See also Jean-Paul Audet, Structures of Christian Priesthood (London, 1967), pp. 134-39.

73. Audet, pp. 157-72

74. In the West, e.g., Ambrose, Letter 63, to the church at Vercellae, and in the East, Chrysostom, On the Priesthood 3:6.

75. Niebuhr and Williams, pp. 56-59

presbyteral ordinations, the collegiality of bishop and presbyters in the one Christian priesthood was clearly evidenced. While the bishop is the high priest of the Church, the presbyters assist and surround him as did the Old Testament priests for the high priest of the Temple.⁷⁶

Increasingly, presbyters were found in situations of autonomous activity; as the number of Christians grew rapidly and as evangelization touched the rural areas and smaller villages, presbyters were established as resident pastors for those outlying communities. Such communities retained a fairly close bond with the "mother church" and the pastor with the bishop whose representative and "extension" he was. Yet by the very nature of the situation, he grew more independent in his activity, providing for his flock what the bishop did for the urban community (instruction, celebration of sacraments, counsel in Christian living, and a good example of the latter). So, too, was applied to them in their liturgical and homiletic activity the notion of "ministers of Christ"; they made possible (and present) for their people the priestly mediation of Christ himself.⁷⁷

Despite the collegiality that existed in liturgical celebrations, this period saw (as we suggested earlier) an increasing movement away from the earlier Christian pattern of including the bishop within the presbyteral collegium. Already firmly established was the view of the presbyters as part of the "lower clergy." They were less colleagues and more assistants, something that was required practically because of the size of the community rather than something that belonged intrinsically

76. This is already clearly expressed in the Didascalia 8-9.

77. Niebuhr and Williams, pp. 56-59

to the structures of the Christian community. As the bishop's assistants, they were under his charge and guidance and supervision.⁷⁸ The image of their relationship was clearly vertical rather than horizontal, a verticality that would find its final expression in the papal primacy as viewed by Gregory VII, Innocent III, and Boniface VIII.

Yet their subordination in rather complete fashion to the bishops did not receive total acceptance, either practically or theoretically, from the presbyters. Letters of some of the bishops to or about their presbyters indicate some claim to more autonomy on the part of the presbyters, even in formulating appropriate liturgy for their people; synodal canons reflect the same.⁷⁹ The most famous and influential formulation of presbyteral counterclaims was that of Jerome.⁸⁰ Actually, Jerome's position was quite nuanced. He recognized as legitimate the episcopal domination of his day,⁸¹ but claimed that it was not so in the primitive Church where a truly collegial presbyterate was the pattern.⁸² He did say explicitly, "Quid enim facit excepta ordinatione Episcopus, quod Presbyter non faciat?"⁸³ and the evidence is now rather decisive that he did know what he was talking about when he reported the custom of the Alexandrian church to have been presbyteral consecration of their bishop.⁸⁴ This will have its theological repercussions later, when the theologians of the Middle

78. Ambrose's relations with his presbyters was a classic example; see F. Dudden, The Life and Times of St. Ambrose (Oxford, 1935), vol. 1, pp. 131-32.

79. K. Morrison, Tradition and Authority in the Western Church 300-1140 (Princeton, N.J., 1969), pp. 87-97

80. Letter 146

81. Letter 15:2

82. Letter 146

83. 146:1

84. W. Telfer, "Episcopal Succession in Egypt," Journal of Ecclesiastical History, III (1952), pp. 1-13

Ages will refuse to see episcopacy as an order distinct from the presbyterate; rather, they will see it as the "fullness," or as the presbyterate "unleashed."⁸⁵

By the death of Gregory I at the beginning of the seventh century the pattern had been firmly established that would eventuate in the notion of the societas christiana in the medieval mentality. It would be a society viewed as basically one unified structure where, by divine ordination, the clergy were located on the higher rungs of the ladder, and within the clergy the bishops above the presbyters, presbyters above the deacons. But the essential functions which were to remain the prerogative of the bishop had emerged (even though the secular affairs of the later bishops would threaten to obscure them) and no significant additions were made.⁸⁶ Occupants of important episcopal sees were men of considerable prestige; they possessed great wealth, dealt with the other prosperous and powerful elements in the society of their day, and generally behaved in princely fashion, even as "princes of the Church." The stage was set for the emergence of the prince bishop, and in his train the power, worldliness, and consequent corruption which, seven hundred years later, would help call the Protestant Revolt into being.

85. These repercussions will be discussed more fully in the next chapter on the development of episcopal identity.

86. The growth of the papal primacy may be seen as a significant subtraction from the bishop's authority in his own right as a member of the episcopal college, but it did not encroach upon the established functions of liturgical presidency, preaching, guardianship of the faith, and administrator within the diocese. Such encroachment did occur later in the fuller development of the Roman system as we will see in Part II of this chapter.

3. The Evidence of Early Ordination Rites

Perhaps the best way to illustrate the changes that occurred in the understanding of the episcopal office in the first six centuries in the West is to examine three of the earliest rites of ordination in terms of their internal evidence and with reference to each other without regard to those other historical factors we have been considering up to now. Such an examination will show change or persistence in themes or imagery, delineation of functions, and, possibly, development in the concept of the office.

The first of the rites (Appendix A) is that of Hippolytus' Apostolic Tradition. It dates from the early third century, and, because Hippolytus maintains that he is recording a tradition current in the Roman church of his youth, the prayer itself may be argued to be fifty years earlier, placing it circa A.D. 150.⁸⁷

The second prayer is from the Leofric Missal, a liturgical book used in Exeter in the Anglo-Saxon era. I place it second (Appendix B) because it seems obviously to be a transition between that of Hippolytus and the third prayer (Appendix C), which is from the Leonine Sacramentary of the late sixth century.⁸⁸ Porter traces the Leofric prayer to Lotharingia early in the tenth century, but believes that its origins are to be found in Gaul, Spain, or northern Italy early in the sixth century.⁸⁹ On the

87. For background and text, see Dix, cited earlier, and G.J. Cuming, ed., Hippolytus: A Text for Students (Bramcote, Notts., 1976).

88. For a discussion of the background and dating of the Leonine Sacramentary, see L. Duchesne, Christian Worship (London, 1903), pp. 135-44.

89. H. Porter, Jr., The Ordination Prayers of the Ancient Western Churches (London, 1967), pp. 72-73

basis that the more distant provinces would be more conservative liturgically about the material they believed to be derived from primitive Roman practice, but remembering also the changes manuscripts underwent as bishops sought to "modernize" their pontificals, we see why the prayer may well antedate the Leonine formulary,⁹⁰ and why it contains elements of the older tradition as well as indications of the changing image of the bishop that was to become so ornate in the Leonine order.⁹¹

Eleven points of comparison and contrast should be observed.

(i) As episcopal prerogative expanded, so did the language of the rite. A glance at the three forms in parallel columns will indicate the growth of formula employed in the act of constituting a bishop. The Hippolytean prayer is tightly constructed with few wasted words. The Leofric tends to wordiness in its opening lines, expanding upon the Hippolytean original, and the Leonine prayer has become lush with compound-complex sentences. The Latin forms, excluding the doxologies, have 173, 194, and 243 words respectively. The Hippolytean is easily divided into three major sections: 1-9 rehearse the mighty acts of God in salvation history; 10-16 invoke and describe the "princely Spirit" that is desired for the ordinand; 17-32 details the functions the bishop is to fulfill and the manner of life he is to lead. What is ironic is that this shortest prayer is the most explicit about episcopal functions. The Leofric also has

90. The Leofric prayer was later incorporated into the Roman Leonine rite, perhaps as an effort to reconcile liturgically conservative elements. See A. Baumstark, Comparative Liturgy (London, 1958), pp. 18-60.

91. The Latin texts are those of Porter. The translation of Hippolytus is Cuming's; the other two translations are Porter's. The division into single line phrasing is mine.

clear divisions, but they are not so neatly done. 1-6 are again a rehearsal of the acts of God in history, and 7-8 involve the ordinand in those acts in the present. 9-10 are two separate sentences of consecration. 11-12 recall the episcopal function of shepherd; the Holy Spirit is invoked in 13, and 14-25 describe more of the personal qualities he should have than the functions he is to perform. 26 asks that he learn from God what he is to teach; 27 is a reminder that priesthood is a task, not a privilege, and the closing lines speak of his honor and merits with a prayer that he be finally admitted to the kingdom. The Leonine uses the first 23 lines to recall the Aaronic priesthood, at no point mentioning Jesus, here or later on. The lines become a bit tighter with the prayer for blessing beginning at 24, and the imagery changes from vestments to oil of anointing. Except for 37 the remainder of the prayer is terse as it describes the character the ordinands should have and the blessings they will need for the proper execution of their office. It would appear that as more words were used, less was said about the nature and function of episcopacy, but we know that the functions were expanding. And it appears that much speaking was thought to be in keeping with the increased dignity of the office.

(ii) The loss of New Testament language and warrant becomes increasingly evident. Almost every section of the Hippolytean prayer can be found to have a New Testament basis, with heavy dependence upon Acts and John. This can be illustrated by the following chart (line numbers always refer to those in the English translations, here in Appendix A):

- 1-2: II Cor. 1:3
- 3: Psalms 113:5-6
- 4: Susanna and the Elders 42
- 5: Acts 14:3
- 6: Gal. 3:6-8
- 7-8:
- 9: John 15:8,16
- 10-14: Acts 1:8; John 15:26
- 15-16:
- 17: Acts 1:24
- 18-19:
- 20: Acts 20:28; John 21:17
- 21-24: overtones of Heb. 2:17; 5:1
- 25:
- 26-27: John 20:23
- 28: Acts 1:26
- 29-30: Matt. 16:19
- 31-32: possibly Matt. 11:29 and Phil. 4:18

It is clear that the activity of the Church is the continuation of that salvation history begun with Abraham, that reached its climax in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus, a ministry which is continued by the operation of the Holy Spirit as the warrants of scripture are carried out.

While the Leofric is clearly based in the scriptures, it does not call passages to mind so readily. The recalling of salvation history is much more a summary of what is in the scriptures than it is a quoting or adaptation of them. Although the catalog of qualifications which is ascribed to "that chosen teacher of the gentiles" uses terms employed by Paul (kindness, hospitality, etc.), the modifiers are not Pauline. The one New Testament line, however, which rings clearly is 11: "Command, O Lord, this man to feed your sheep." There is no mistaking the central New Testament warrant for the work of a bishop.

New Testament references are almost completely lost in the Leonine prayer. The first half of it deals with mystical references to the vesture of the Aaronic high priesthood, and the prayer itself seems a bit unclear

as to what it is talking about when it refers to (19) "whatsoever it was that those veils signified" (quicquid illa velamina ... signabant)!

When the imagery turns to the anointing (27) there is a hint of Psalms 133 and possibly of the function of the bishop as a sign of unity, but the reference is too obscure to make a strong case for it.⁹² The Spirit as the agent of ordination is mentioned in 30; but, as we saw earlier, there is, except for the ritual doxology which is not strictly a part of the prayer, no mention of Jesus Christ at all. The high priesthood is derived from Jewish precedents and has no relation to the priesthood of Christ, as far as the evidence alone here would show.

(iii) The Spirit continues to be mentioned and invoked as the source of power for the work of ministry, but the loss of emphasis on the Spirit is marked. Hippolytus refers to the Spirit as a "princely Spirit" (11), and as a "spirit of high priesthood" (25) by whom power is given to the ordinand for absolving (26), ordering (28), and loosing (29). Leofric invokes the Spirit almost immediately after the reference to the laying on of hands (11, 13), and sees the Spirit as the source of "heavenly gifts" bestowed by the bishop. In the Leonine prayer the Spirit appears to come as a result of the anointing (27-32), and is not associated with the laying on of hands. The ordinands are to be filled with "the power of your Spirit," but what that power does is not defined.

(iv) The laying on of hands begins to take a place beside other

92. For some hints as to what the imagery may have signified to the medieval mind, see J.H. Crehan, "The Typology of Episcopal Consecration," Theological Studies, 21 (1960), pp. 250-55, and E. Kirschbaum, Lexikon der Christlichen Ikonographie (Rome, 1968), 8 vol.

matter by the time of the Leonine prayer. Although it is not mentioned explicitly in the prayer, we know from Hippolytus' rubrics that ~~it~~ it was recited by one of the bishops with his hand upon the head of the ordinand. The Leofric prayer is quite clear about two things. First, the laying on of hands is still the central matter of the rite. Secondly, the consecrator is God. It might be said on the basis of the text that the outward rite only confers a dignitas, and that the Church trusts God to provide the order. "By you may he be consecrated to the high priesthood to which he is lifted up. Though the hand be ours, let your blessing rest upon him." Although laying on of hands is still practiced in the Leonine rite, it is the image of the anointing that has grasped the imagination, so that fully seven lines are devoted to it (26-32).

(v) References to the bishop-elect change from singular to plural. No longer are bishops consecrated singly, each in his own church among those who have chosen him for that office. More than likely the bishop is consecrated by the Pope in Rome or by the Metropolitan. This would tend to indicate that the episcopacy has become a gift bestowed from above, not the result of the free choice of free electors.⁹³ Another indication that Leofric is a "bridge rite" is that in some of the pontificals where it occurs,⁹⁴ both singular and plural forms are given.

(vi) The rehearsal of specific salvation history gives way to vague mystical allusions about the meaning of the high priest's vestments in the Old Testament. At the same time the Old Testament images change from

93. N. Sykes, "The Election of Bishops," in Bishops, G. Simon, ed. (London, 1961), pp. 54-57

94. H. Wilson, ed., The Pontifical of Magdalen College (London, 1910), pp. 75-76

that of Abraham to that of Moses and Aaron. This is paralleled by the development in the life of the Church as it moved from understanding itself as a pilgrim people on a journey in faith to being a settled institution with a developing and intricate legal system. The bishop has become more judge than father, more prince than shepherd. Is this development in the prayer also a reflection of the circumstance of the bishop becoming more removed from the ordinary life of the ordinary Christian, no longer performing those functions which made him a pastor, so now needing vague and undefined authority and justification for a position that was losing its contact with the people it has originally been intended to serve?

(vii) The emphasis upon high priesthood is constant in all three prayers. For Hippolytus the ordinand is "to exercise the high priesthood" (21); the Leofric prayer is offered that "he be consecrated to the high priesthood" (9); and in the Leonine rite he is spoken of as one chosen by God "for the ministry of the high priesthood" (17). What does change is the imagery surrounding the term, so that in the first prayer we have a rather clear statement as to what it involves, if not what it means, but by the Leonine prayer it no longer involves any specific acts and the meaning is set forth in terms of mystical symbolism relating to the Old Testament cult.

(viii) Another constant in all three prayer is the emphasis upon the personal qualities which should characterize the holder of the episcopate. It is worth noting that as the detailed enumeration of functions grows less, the description of desirable personal characteristics increases! Experientia docet. In Hippolytus, the bishop is expected to please God "in gentle-

ness and a pure heart" (31). The prayer from the Leofric Missal presents a catalog of traits (15-24) that would daunt the most virtuous: just, kind, hospitable, faithful, loving, patient, true, steadfast, and peaceable. The Leonine prayer reduces these to "constancy of faith, purity of love, sincerity of peace" (34-36). Although it does not have as long a list as the earlier prayer, it is concerned that the meaning of priesthood "show forth in the character and deeds" (23) of those ordained. Obviously the concern for the bishop as moral exemplar and a living illustration of what it means to be "in Christ" did not lessen, and may have increased as some of the developing contradictions in life style became strikingly evident to the simplest peasant.

(ix) Side by side with the emphasis on personal holiness is an increase of references to the honor which is due the bishop. The seeds of honor, dignity, and station are planted in Hippolytus. "Princes and priests" keep company in line 7; bishops are to receive power of "the princely Spirit" (11). By virtue of that princely power they are able to do in the spiritual realm what earthly princes do in the secular: absolve, appoint, set free. It is hard to see how in any human society such associations would not lead to the outward dignities of power, even if they be called "spiritualities." The function of the bishop as judge is evident in the Leofric prayer (15, 24-25), and although it is recognized that priesthood is a task and not a privilege, it is also requested that he may receive "increase of honour" (28) "to the encouragement of his merits" (29). The opening line of the Leonine prayer is addressed to the "God of all honours, God of all the worthy ranks." These may be interpreted as purely

spiritual references, but it is more likely that the honors were seen as those to be bestowed upon the ordinand, and the worthy ranks were those members of the episcopacy "which serve to your glory in holy orders" (2). We are told there is a "pontifical glory" (12), although it does not depend upon outward signs. Rather, they receive "all the adornments of glory" (25). But now also for the first time mention is made of the "episcopal throne" (37), not the chair of the teacher, but the sign of authority "to rule your Church and entire people." The prince-bishop is certainly on the way, even if he has not yet arrived.

(x) Preaching, teaching, and faithfulness under persecution are mentioned only in the second prayer. This seems to be another reason for placing it in time between the other two. Hippolytus, if it is as early as 150, would not yet be in a period that had to deal with widespread persecution on a systematic basis. The Leonine prayer, with its image of the bishop ruling the Church and entire people, seems to have left persecution and its defections behind. It does ask for "constancy of faith" (34), but this may just as well refer to the doctrinal controversies of the post-Constantinian era. In the earlier prayer preaching and teaching were still functions shared with the itinerant apostles, prophets, and teachers. It is surprising when one considers the biblical framework of that prayer, that none of the references which might be used for those functions with regard to the ministry were employed. A case may be made that these were not seen in Rome, at least, as the exclusive property of the bishop. The Apostolic Tradition implies that the job of preparing catechumens was already that of someone, cleric or lay, other

than the bishop (18-19). By the fifth century, as we have seen, the bishop was absolutely in charge of preaching and teaching, even if he did not or could not manage it all on his own. The Leofric prayer would reflect the practice of that period, particularly if, as Porter suggests, it is as early as the beginning of the sixth century. Also, one may suggest that the teaching function is implied in the "constancy of faith" petition in the Leonine prayer, but the reference is too poetic in its context for certainty.

(xi) Perhaps most significant of all for this study is the loss of the enumeration of just what functions the bishop was expected to perform. There can be little doubt that this reflects the actual circumstance as the bishops delegated more and more of their functions to the presbyters and the presbyterate accordingly came to be understood as having sacerdotal rank. Hippolytus says that first, the bishop is to feed the flock (20). Secondly, he is to exercise the high priesthood (21), and what this means is spelled out distinctly. It is a constant service ("serving night and day"); it is a ministry of propitiation, and it involves the offering of the gifts. The "spirit of high priesthood" gives the ordinand the power to forgive sins, to confer orders, and to loose every bond (26-29). It should be observed that there is here no simple equation of forgiving sins with loosing bonds. They are seen as two distinct functions: pronouncing absolution and imposing penance. It is possible that the forgiveness of sin may also be equated with the baptismal rite and the bishop's presiding function there. Finally, the bishop is to please God by the quality of his life.

The Leofric prayer asks that the ordinand "be worthy in all the services and all the functions faithfully performed" (7), but does not indicate what those may be. It is, however, most explicit in the direction about feeding the sheep (11-12). He is not only to feed but to guard, possibly another reference to increasing difficulty with false teaching and persecution. It may be argued that lines 15-24 describe functions, but they seem primarily to be manifestations of Christian living, as we argued above, for which he is to set an example to the flock, more than functions given to the bishop which only he by virtue of his office can perform.⁹⁵ The Leofric prayer is unique in that it presents the bishop as a student: "...may he learn from you ... all the things which he should teach..." (26). He is to be a "bestower of heavenly gifts" (13), but this is so closely connected to the examples of Christian living that it would be a misinterpretation to apply to that any Eucharistic allusion. That is intended in the eighth line, "to celebrate the mysteries of the sacraments."

The Leonine function of the bishop is expressed in two words, "to rule" (ad regendam). No other "job description" is to be found. He is to rule in faith, love, and peace, but with the strength, might, and support of God. No reference to feeding the sheep is found, unless one wants in charity to relate ad regendam to Dominus regit me!

95. An exception might be made for exhortation and judgment, since the latter was clearly an episcopal burden, as we know from Augustine's complaints, and if exhortation is understood to involve the preaching office.

We see from this brief look at three early consecration rites evidence of the history of the development of episcopal functions from the second century to the beginning of the Middle Ages. The original functions became so distributed as to be no longer recognizably episcopal, so that all reference to them was omitted, and the remaining function had become so associated with secular rule that the need for the office itself stood in question.

II. Since the Reformation

A. The Background to Reformation

The sacramental and administrative prerogatives of the episcopacy had been generally established by the year 1000, although debate continued throughout the Middle Ages as to the relationship of those prerogatives to the order itself.¹ What was at issue for centuries was the confusion between episcopal authority and the exercise of episcopal power.

To some extent the two realities must always coexist, for authority is meaningless if one does not possess the power to make the authority operative. Yet there are many kinds of authority, each with its correlative kind of power, and in the history of the Church a distorted understanding of the Christian community has come not only from mistaking power for authority, but also from misunderstanding what kind of authority and power is proper to a Church which is the sacramental means of establishing the Kingdom of God.²

1. We will consider this debate in the next chapter on episcopal identity.
2. A. Ecclestone, "The Bishop and His Relationship with God," in Today's Church and Today's World, pp. 229-35

Although the discussion was moved into a church-state framework, the troubled relationship between secular rulers and the ecclesiastical establishment in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was heir to the patristic and medieval conflict of regnum and sacerdotium. The notion of a societas christiana, which had the clergy as its "soul," was fading quickly in those centuries. The two great symbols of this unified spiritual-temporal society, the papacy and the emperor, became increasingly less important for many portions of Europe; but the societas christiana still remained as a confusing assumption and ideal.

In the attempt to free themselves from constraining secular power, first from the Byzantine rulers and then from the various rulers of medieval Europe, the popes insisted on the superior authority of the sacerdotium and insisted that the functions of this sacerdotium did not fall under the judgment of the regnum. Unfortunately, this position, which could from one point of view be justified, ends up as the claim that all authority (civil and ecclesiastical) has been given to the pope as the head of the societas christiana, and he delegates civil authority to secular rulers. Such a view served to intensify the notion of one society, but it also gave the impression that civil and ecclesiastical authority were quite similar in nature.³

Because the implementation of ecclesiastical discipline, particularly the appointment and ordination of worthy bishops and priests, was in many instances hindered by secular rulers who illegitimately used various forms of power to accomplish a goal that lay outside their proper authority,

3. W. Ullmann, The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages (London, 1970), pp. 262-358

medieval bishops and popes countered with a use of power that was alien to the intrinsic authority of the episcopacy. By and large the medieval papacy and episcopacy sought objectives within the sphere of their own proper function and authority. These were objectives such as the dissemination of the gospel, the elevation of man's moral behavior, the sincere practice of Christian virtue and worship, and the correction of erroneous understandings of the faith. However, in working towards these goals they saw themselves as rulers who should enforce the law of God by whatever means proved effective: by threatening damnation, by cutting men off from salvation through excommunication, by supporting those political figures who in turn would enforce (particularly on the clergy in their territory) the papal legislation, or in extreme cases by attempting to depose secular rulers who were judged to be a scandal to the faithful.⁴

The episcopacy (and in growing measure the papacy) was armed with vast power: the power that flowed from possession of the keys to the Kingdom of Heaven and the social-moral power that gradually accrued to the episcopacy and papacy because of their central role in the development of medieval Europe. They could intervene most effectively in the world of secular politics, and they did. This power was a means of obtaining from the secular ruler the freedom and autonomy of the Church. It was also a means of securing from the ruler the kind of personal and official behavior that became a Christian prince, although this was more often an ideal than a reality. However, such power could be abused to further the personal prestige or wealth or secular influence of bishop or pope. Abuses of this

4. Ullmann, pp. 299-309

nature became particularly flagrant in the papacy of the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries and unquestionably provided an important emotional element in the build-up to the Protestant Reformation and seriously sapped the religious vitality of the pre-Reformation Church. Yet, in the last analysis, such abuses precisely because they were seen as abuses may have done less harm than the sincere but misguided employment of secular power to enforce ecclesiastical decisions.

The danger of this course of action became very real for the Church in the pre-Reformation period. In its efforts to reassert its power in the face of conciliar theories of church authority, the papacy after the Council of Constance turned to diplomacy and to support from secular monarchs. The price it had to pay for the various concordats that guaranteed such support was to grant these secular princes a yet greater voice in church affairs, especially in appointments to rich benefices. In such dealings the pope was becoming more and more just another monarch among the monarchs of Europe. Linked with this was the ecclesiology developed by John of Torquemada in conjunction with the Council of Basel. His Summa de ecclesia, which had a normative effect on the sixteenth and seventeenth century Roman Catholic defense of the papacy, stressed as a basic premise the monarchical character of authority in the Church.⁵ Thus the Roman Catholic Church, in the struggle between absolute monarchs and representative government which made up so much of the political history of modern Europe, was apparently situated quite clearly in the camp of monarchy.

But if the pope became, in the late medieval period, more and more a

5. E. Gratsch, Where Peter Is: A Survey of Ecclesiology (New York, 1975), pp. 102-03

temporal sovereign, he was not alone among the higher ecclesiastics. Throughout the Middle Ages they functioned as counselors and administrators for secular rulers and in not a few instances (e.g., the prince-bishops of the German Imperial structure) bishops were themselves autonomous secular princes. Given the unified view of European society as Christendom that prevailed in those centuries, it was logical for a king or prince to seek competent and trustworthy officials from among the better educated, and that generally meant the higher clergy. However, this clearly involved the bishops concerned in a conflict of interests, diverted them from the careful fulfillment of their episcopal function, and created in them an understanding of their episcopal authority and power which scarcely flowed from evangelical principles. Wolsey and Richelieu were worthy successors of this tradition.⁶

The bishops paid the price for their confusion in both Reformation and Counter-Reformation. Among the Protestants they either suffered total abolition (as in Scotland) or absorption into an Erastian state-church (as in England); and among the Romans the process towards total papal control was accelerated in spite of the decentralizing efforts of Gallianism. We will now proceed to examine briefly the effect of the post-Tridentine period on the Roman episcopate, and the effect of Erastianism upon the Anglicans.

6. See W. Wilkie, The Cardinal Protectors of England (London, 1974) for a study of Wolsey and the exercise of power politics, and D. O'Connell, Richelieu (London, 1968) for a sympathetic examination of the cardinal as a man who was wrestling with the dilemmas involved in "formulating the concept of the modern state as a necessary moral end."

B. The Roman Episcopate from Trent to Vatican II

Given the broad scope of Trent's doctrinal judgments and reform measures, it is highly significant that it produced no decree on the structure of the Church nor on the authority of the pope.⁷ It is true that some of this is contained in the reform decrees about ministry and in the decree on Holy Orders, but the fundamental issue regarding ecclesiastical jurisdiction, the relationship between papacy and episcopacy, could not be resolved at the council and had to be left a somewhat open question, and so the entire matter of authority and power in the Church remained unclear at the council's close. Against the Reformers' attacks on the evangelical origin of the Catholic bishops and priests, Trent could say that the hierarchy of bishops, presbyters, and ministers was instituted divina ordinatione.⁸ But the council avoided taking a position on the source of episcopal jurisdiction, whether it came directly from God or was mediated through the pope. The bitter disagreement on this point, which finally surfaced during the last winter of the council (1562-63) could not be worked out in discussion. Not only the continuance of the council but also the unity of the Roman Catholic community seemed threatened by the controversy. Obviously, the conciliarist theories were not completely dead. Though the pope could not obtain from the council a definition of papal primacy, he did manage to avoid a definition favoring conciliarism.⁹

7. J. Waterworth, ed., The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent (London, 1848)

8. Waterworth, p. 174

9. H. Jedin, Crisis and Closure of the Council of Trent (London, 1967), pp. 80-115

If it could not resolve the pope-bishops relationship, Trent did bring some order into the episcopal-presbyteral relationship. This was achieved through its disciplinary decrees on preaching and clerical reform.¹⁰ The decree on preaching placed the nurture and control of preaching, even that done by religious, firmly in the hands of the bishops. The decree on reform legislated against the ordination of "unattached" presbyters, conditioned presbyteral power to absolve sin upon episcopal approval, and laid upon the bishop the responsibility of approving (and, if necessary, training) candidates for ordination. However, it seems fair to say that the Tridentine decision about jurisdiction in these contexts was a practical pastoral judgment rather than an attempt to clarify theologically the nature of ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

Trent's approach to ecclesiastical jurisdiction marked an emphasis that was different from that of the Middle Ages, an emphasis that would become increasingly clear in subsequent centuries. In the Middle Ages, the potestas jurisdictionis was certainly seen as touching the teaching authority of the ordained (the action of synods and councils in handling doctrinal issues testifies to this), but the emphasis was rather on the manner in which ecclesiastical authority functioned in the overall government of European society. This political arena was the scene of dispute between sacerdotium and imperium and it was at least partially the context of papal-episcopal controversy. It was in relationship to the contest for power between pope and king that so much of the literature

10. Waterworth, pp. 27-9, 49-52, 81-9, 111-20, 175-92, 208-12

regarding papal authority came into existence.¹¹ As the Reformation raised the issue of large-scale heresy, the emphasis in theological dispute shifted to the issue of authority in doctrinal matters. Increasingly the magisterial or teaching authority of the bishops and particularly of the pope was stressed. To some extent, this shift of attention from the political to the magisterial was connected with the changing political structures of sixteenth and seventeenth century Europe, and to the fact that relations between pope and princes were resolved on the basis of diplomacy and concordat. But it was also due to the fact that the Reformation period inherited the notion of an ecclesiastical authority called potestas jurisdictionis, which was distinct from the potestas ordinis, which was concerned with governing the social order of the Church, indeed of all human society, and which pertained de jure divino to pope and bishops. And since this power of jurisdiction was assumed to be basic to the Church's order, for it was of divine institution, churchmen and theologians and jurists had to find some place to locate it once its application to the political-social sphere became less relevant. A considerable part of this relocation consisted in emphasizing the official church as the authoritative teacher of Christians and to some extent of all men. A reflection of the manner in which doctrinal authority was being seen as jurisdictional, rather than as consisting in possession of theological insight, can be found in Trent's decree on preaching, and in its description of the way in which bishops were to control preaching.¹²

11. R. Benson, The Bishop-Elect: A Study in Medieval Ecclesiastical Office (Princeton, 1968)

12. Waterworth, pp. 27-9, 211-12

Surprisingly (at least to twentieth century Catholics, who have become accustomed to equating magisterium with episcopal and especially papal teaching), the Roman Catholic Church at the time of the Council of Trent did not have an explanation of teaching authority that totally identified the magisterium with the episcopate, as most post-Tridentine theology did. Yet it was taken for granted that the corporate voice of the bishops assembled in general council was the ultimate criterion of Christian orthodoxy.¹³ Trent was finally convoked in response to the demand for just such a corporate judgment.

The assumption that underlay the activity and decrees of the council was the supreme authority of the episcopate (involving, of course, the pope, but without specifying exactly his relation to the council) in doctrinal matters. Yet, despite the disillusionment with the papacy that the Avignon captivity and the Great Western Schism had caused, and despite the Renaissance papacy's own need for reform, bishops as well as other Christians still looked to Rome in the early sixteenth century to initiate the needed reform of the Church and to provide doctrinal clarification by convoking a council. So, within those portions of the Church which did not follow the Reformers, the pope continued to exercise his supreme doctrinal authority throughout the Reformation and into the post-Tridentine period. It was papal action that first brought decisive judgment against Luther; it was the popes who passed judgment against the monarchs who claimed supremacy over the English church. During the Council of Trent the popes continuously worked through their legates to direct the progress of the

13. H. Jedin, A History of the Council of Trent (London, 1961), vol. 1, pp. 213-15

council, and it was the popes who guided the post-Tridentine reforms of the church.¹⁴

From a theological point of view, the Council of Trent's discussion of ordained ministry is disappointing; but it was the intent of the council fathers to set limits between acceptable Catholic teaching and unacceptable views (presumably those of the Reformers), though after some debate the council agreed not to condemn any Reformers by name, and not to give any extended theological treatment.¹⁵ Even granting this delimited purpose, the council exhibited little interest in the basic theological issues. The groundwork for discussion of sacraments in general had been laid by collecting a list of questionable views on sacraments and formulating theological response to them. Yet, in the ensuing debates about the basic principles of Catholic doctrine on sacraments there was no real probing into the issues raised by the Reformers nor indeed into the issues raised by the council's own theologians. Instead, there was unmistakable intent on the part of the council to avoid theological questions.¹⁶ One can appreciate this when there was a question of avoiding the centuries-old debate as to whether sacraments involved physical or moral causality. But it is difficult to see how the council could avoid deeper study of the relation between faith and sacrament.

If the council's discussion of the basic principles of sacramental doctrine avoided theological issues, the lengthy debate about the sacrament

14. L. von Ranke, The History of the Popes During the Last Four Centuries (London, 1908), vol. 2

15. Jedin, History, vol. 2, pp. 380-81, 386-92

16. Jedin, History, vol. 2, pp. 380-91, and E. Schillebeeckx, The Eucharist (London, 1968), pp. 29-76

of orders (from September to December of 1562) seemed scarcely aware of the Reformation challenge to the traditional understandings of Christian ministry. There was some time devoted to examination and reassertion of ordination as one of the seven sacraments; but the great bulk of the discussion focused on episcopal prerogatives, and represented a continuation of the controversies that had been going on for centuries regarding the extent of episcopal authority over ordained presbyters and the dependence or independence of bishops vis-a-vis the papacy in the matter of jurisdiction. The classic distinction between potestas ordinis and potestas jurisdictionis was the unchallenged foundation for this lengthy debate, and invariably the controversy centered on the source and limits of episcopal jurisdiction. Beneath the surface of this discussion lay not the questions raised by Reformation theology, but rather the power struggle between papacy and episcopacy.

While its effective political power in the affairs of secular governments steadily diminished, Rome's exercise of ecclesiastical jurisdiction (and concomitantly its exercise of a certain moral power in those nations with predominantly Catholic populations) reached unprecedented levels from the mid-nineteenth century onward.¹⁷ Ultramontanism gained dominance over the Gallicanism of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and was solidly entrenched by the proceedings of Vatican I. It did not dissipate all remaining elements of Gallican sentiment, but the third chapter of the council's dogmatic constitution Pastor aeternus left no question about the completeness of the pope's jurisdiction. His authority extends not just

17. Latourette, Expansion, vol. 4, pp. 23-32

to teaching, but to discipline and government (ad disciplinam et regimen); it pertains to all members of the church throughout the world; it touches all of them immediately, and no one may legitimately interfere with the pope's direct communication to these members; the pope is the one supreme pastor of the flock; he is the supreme judge, the last court of appeals in all ecclesiastical matters, subject himself to no judgment within the church. This description of the jurisdictional authority of the pope was incorporated into the code of canon law, but what gives it its unique status as a binding law within a faith community is the fact that Vatican I expressed it not in a disciplinary decree but as an explicitly intended proposition in a dogmatic constitution. And the practical result was that bishops around the world found themselves the servants of the Vatican bureaucratic structure which, in the name of the pontiff, could give or withhold those necessary faculties without which a bishop could not function effectively even within his own diocese.

The image of the bishop which became dominant as a result of Vatican I cast him in the role of deputy to the pope, deriving authority from him (though Vatican I had not said precisely that), carrying out papal policy in doctrinal control and ecclesiastical management, and representing to the faithful of his diocese the pastoral concern and guidance of "the supreme Pastor." As preparations for Vatican II advanced, and even more so as the actual sessions discussing the proposed Constitution on the Church began, it became apparent that Vatican I had left unclarified the precise role and authority of the episcopacy.¹⁸ While Vatican II did not give a

18. J. Miller, ed., Vatican II: An Interfaith Appraisal (Notre Dame, 1966), pp. 129-35

thoroughly satisfactory explanation of the relationship between papal and episcopal authority (since the critical text which we will examine more closely in Chapter Three, the third chapter of the dogmatic Constitution on the Church, juxtaposes without intrinsic resolution the papal absolutism of Vatican I and the episcopal collegiality "discovered" by the fathers of Vatican II), it did reverse the trend of Vatican I by reinserting the bishop of Rome within the episcopal collegium and by altering the operative image of the bishop.

C. The Anglican State-Episcopate

Though Protestantism cannot be seen as the cause of ~~the~~ established *national churches*, the occurrence of the Reformation was responsible for formalizing the arrangement. While there had been various working relationships between the Church and civil governments, there was no need to formalize the particular government's approval or tolerance of a given church as long as all Europe was one Christian Church.¹⁹ With the Reformation all this was changed. By the time of the Peace of Augsburg (1555) the principle cuius regio, eius religio was adopted; the prince had the responsibility of regulating the institutional life of the church. His ecclesiastical function began to be viewed quite logically as derivative from his political authority.²⁰ On the Protestant side, this Erastian

19. An exception (and a forerunner of the post-Reformation practice) was the position of the Utraquists in fifteenth century Bohemia. See J. Bradley, Czechoslovakia (Edinburgh, 1971), pp. 49-66.

20. See J. Lecler, Toleration and Reformation (London, 1960), vol. 1, pp. 258-59. As Lecler points out, the phrase "cuius regio, eius religio" is not itself used in the Peace of Augsburg; instead, the equivalent "ubi unus dominus, ibi una sit religio" is found.

solution was adopted in the Lutheran sections of Germany, in Scandanavia, and in England, that is, wherever the state was headed by a monarch. On the Catholic side, a comparable situation prevailed under the Bourbon and Hapsburg monarchs, even when the official Roman theology did not accept the Gallican claims of those rulers to control ecclesiastical affairs. Somewhat different patterns were adopted in Switzerland and the Low Countries (and for a time in Britain, under the Commonwealth) because the political structure was more representative and because Calvinism which was dominant there tended towards rule by a theocratic community. But even there the privileged existence of one church was established by law. In this section we will examine particularly the use of episcopacy in the Church of England since it is that Church which in subsequent centuries has stressed the importance of the "historic succession" in its conversations with other Protestant bodies.^{20a}

1. The 16th and 17th Centuries

Insight into the Anglican understanding of the episcopacy is complicated by the pluralism of theological opinion and the oscillation of official policy within the Church of England, by the fact that the Church of England's origin is to be explained to quite an extent by political pragmatism rather than by theological interest, and by the manner in which the struggles within the Church of England between episcopalianism and presbyterianism were interlocked with the conflict between monarchical and representative forms of civil government. Moreover, the geographical and

^{20a}. The most recent summary of the development of the Anglican episcopate is to be found in R. Hanson, Christian Priesthood Examined (London, 1979), pp. 83-88.

political situation of Britain made it impractical to resolve doctrinal conflicts by the continental strategy of cuius regio, eius religio, and so the government (civil and ecclesiastical) of England, in order to preserve national unity, moved more towards tolerant acceptance of divergent religious views than it did towards theological unanimity.

It is interesting to observe the comparative ease with which episcopal authority was surrendered to the will of Henry VIII. The bishops, having compromised themselves by their acquiescence in 1531 to the royal supremacy over the church, found themselves subscribing to the Ten Articles of 1536, then to the royal injunctions of 1538, and finally to the King's Book of 1543, each of them a step away from the old faith and towards continental Protestantism.²¹ Recalcitrants there were, and they suffered accordingly, but it is still the layman, Thomas More, who is chiefly remembered as the martyr for papal supremacy, and not any of those bishops who at their consecrations had sworn allegiance to the bishop of Rome. Even allowing for that fragilitas carnis which would lead one to avoid the scaffold, part of the reason for their attitude must be the result of that accommodation of the Church to the state which had begun in the later Middle Ages.

Before we begin an examination of episcopal functions as described in the first two prayerbooks of Edward VI and the prayerbook of 1662, it may be well to recall the comment of Barry Till in his essay on the episcopal attitudes of the period:²²

21. See P. Hughes, The Reformation in England (New York, 1951), vol. 2, pp. 22-57.

22. K.M. Carey, ed., The Historic Episcopate (London, 1954), p. 68

...they did not attempt ... any speculative theology of the episcopate in its relation to the being of the church. The weight of the evidence militates against the claim that 'the official attitude of the (Elizabethan) Church emphatically was ... that the bishops and the bishops alone ... constitute in themselves that essential body of persons without which there could be no Church' /K. Kirk, ed., The Apostolic Ministry, p. 406/. The Elizabethan bishops continued the episcopal government of the church in its traditional methods and function, not so much because of any theory of episcopacy, as because this was the custom of the Church in England, which, in their belief and through their actions, remained the Church of England.

Let us now see, on the basis of the textual evidence provided by the official Ordinals of the new/old church, what that church understood the functions of its bishops to be. An outline of the rites may be found in Appendix D.

It is clear that the primary function of the bishop is to preach and teach, if one is to judge purely on the basis of the amount of textual evidence. This is a function shared with the priests, but the bishop's task is greater than theirs in that he is also to judge the orthodoxy of their preaching. The 1549 rite provided for an introit psalm before the service, the choice of psalms being the same for both ordination of priests and consecration of bishops. The psalm intended for primary use was Psalm 40, which not only lays stress upon the ministry of proclamation ("I have declared thy righteousness in the great congregation; ...my talk hath been of thy truth and of thy salvation"), but deliberately contrasts that with the inefficacy of sacrificial worship ("Sacrifice and meat-offering thou wouldest not: but mine ears hast thou opened. Burnt-offerings and sacrifice for sin hast thou not required..."). This rejection of the concept of a sacrificial priesthood as it had come to be understood in the Roman

church is even more obvious in the Latin form of the psalm: Sacrificium et oblationem noluisti. This introit was banished in the 1552 book along with all proper introits, but its use indicates the intention of the Reformers to exalt the preaching ministry at the expense of the sacrificing priest. A proper collect did not appear until 1662, but it altered nothing. It selects two episcopal functions for emphasis: "that they may diligently preach thy Word, and duly administer the godly Discipline thereof." The epistle from I Timothy describes among the other qualifications of a bishop that he should be "apte to teache"; and the alternate lesson for the epistle, added in 1662, has St. Paul warning the presbyteroi-episkopoi of Ephesus that they must be on guard against false teaching. 1662 also saw the addition of an alternate Gospel, the Great Commission in Matthew, with its command to go and preach. The Prayer after the Litany asks that the elect be replenished "with the truth of thy doctrine." The second, third, and fourth questions of the Examination all have reference to the teaching function and authority of the episcopate. The Prayer of Consecration, immediately prior to the Imposition of Hands, asks "that he may evermore be ready to spread abroad thy Gospel." The Delivery of the Bible relates to the bishop as a minister of the Word, and that Word becomes in 1552 the basis for the exercise of governing, when the delivery of the pastoral staff is omitted but the formula which accompanied it is retained and added to the formula accompanying the Bible. Finally, the post-communion prayer invokes the blessing of God upon the newly consecrated bishop "that he preaching thy Word, may ... be earnest to reprove, beseech, and rebuke with all patience and doctrine..."

The second largest amount of textual evidence relating to episcopal functions is that concerning shepherding and governing. The opening collect reminds us that the bishop is to "duly administer the godly Discipline" found in the Word. The epistle speaks of the necessity of ruling one's own household well if one is to bear rule in the Church, and St. Paul emphasizes the image of the shepherd in his address to the Ephesian elders. The Gospel is that of the Dominical command to Peter to "feed my sheep." 1549 had as alternative Gospel the Good Shepherd passage from John 10; this was retained in 1552, but was removed in 1662 in favor of John 20:19-23, where Jesus appears to the disciples after his resurrection, breathes the Spirit upon them, and gives them the authority to forgive or retain sin. The choice of this alternative was dictated by the need of scriptural warrant for the change in the Imposition formula, and not by any great consideration for the significance of the rest of the passage.²³ Verse 23 may easily relate to the shepherding function, but such would not appear to be the intention of the Caroline divines who supervised the revision. If they had wanted to stress the shepherding and governing function there would have been no need to abandon John 10.²⁴ It was the formula, "Receive the Holy Spirit," that was their chief concern. The introduction to the Examination makes clear that in laying on of hands a person is admitted "to government in the Church of Christ." Question

23. The emphasis is upon the reception of the Holy Spirit by the apostles; the revision was designed to stress the fact that the bishops succeeded the apostles in government, discipline, and the power to ordain. The authority to forgive sins is already employed in the formula for the ordination of priests; there would be no need to lay emphasis upon it here.

24. John 10 was not abandoned in that it became the Gospel for the ordination of priests.

Six of the Examination describes part of the episcopal function as to "maintain and set forward ... quietness, love, and peace among all men; and such as be unquiet, disobedient, and criminous within your Diocese, correct and punish, according to such authority as you have by God's Word..." The last question stresses the charitable aspect of episcopal supervision: "Will you shew yourself gentle, and be merciful for Christ's sake to poor and needy people, and to all strangers destitute of help?" The Delivery of the Bible (and staff, in 1549) reinforces the need to be "a shepherd, and not a wolf." And the Prayer of Consecration defines the proper use of "the authority given to him, not to destruction, but to salvation, not to hurt, but to help..."

That the bishop should be a moral exemplar to his flock is not taken for granted in these rites, but is underscored in the epistle, the prayer at the end of the Litany, Question Five of the Examination, and in the post-communion collect. The epistle catalogs such qualities as "blameless, the husband of one wife, diligent, sober, discreet, a keeper of hospitality, ...not given to overmuch wine, no fighter, not greedy of filthy lucre, but gentle, abhorring fighting, abhorring covetousness," noting also that to avoid scandal "he must also have a good report of them which are without." At the conclusion of the Litany the prayer requests that the bishop be adorned "with innocency of life" for "the edifying and well-governing of thy Church." The two goals of edification and avoidance of scandal are reflected in the Examination: "Will you deny all ungodliness and worldly lusts, and live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world, that you may shew yourself in all things an example of good works

unto others, that the adversary may be ashamed, having nothing to say against you?" And the post-communion provides a final reminder that he is to be "a wholesome example in word, in conversation, in love, in faith, in chastity, and in purity."

A fourth function that must be exercised by a bishop in the Church of England is that of servant to the crown. The emphasis on this is not great, but it is certainly pronounced; first, by the reading of the King's Mandate for the Consecration, a reminder that the bishop-elect owes his preferment to the monarch's pleasure; and then, in the period we are considering, the Oath Touching the Acknowledgment of the King's Supremacy was required to be taken as a part of the service.²⁵ The specifically anti-Roman character of the Oath disappeared in 1662, but there was no diminution of emphasis on the sovereign's authority over things spiritual or the bishop's responsibility "to bear faith and true allegiance to the King's Highness, his Heirs and lawful Successors," and to "assist and defend all jurisdictions, privileges, preeminences, and authorities, granted or belonging to the King's Highness, His Heirs and Successors." It was this oath that resulted in the paradox of such a tender conscience as Bishop Ken's suffering imprisonment under a monarch who sought to re-establish the Roman church, but then also having to suffer deprivation of office by that monarch's successor because he refused to recognize the new king's legitimacy in faithfulness to the oath as he understood it. Finally, in the Examination, the bishop-elect is reminded that he is called to his

25. The taking of oaths in services of worship was discontinued in the 19th century, with the exception of the oath of obedience to the archbishop at the consecration of a bishop.

office by "the order of this Realm," and that part of his authority in the administration of his diocese is his only because it has been "committed by the Ordinance of this Realm" (Questions One and Six).

Lastly, both in point of time of its admission to the rite and in the emphasis laid upon it in the text, there is the function of "ordaining, sending, or laying hands upon others." This is found in the next to the last question of the Examination, and it only appeared in 1662. It is, in fact, the only question that would identify the Examination as pertaining to bishops, with the exception of the word "Diocese" which appears in the question before it.

On the basis of the textual evidence of the rites, then, we can say that for the Church of England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the bishop had not the fullness of priesthood, but rather the fullness of the teaching office, an office he exercised as a servant of the crown with responsibility for the governing or shepherding of those churches committed to him.

2. The Eighteenth Century

Reaction against the fanatical devotion to religion which could result in the cruelties of the religious wars of the two previous centuries coupled with the growing influence of rationalism and the enlightenment produced in the eighteenth century an atmosphere of toleration for diverse religious opinion at best and indifferentism at worst.²⁶ The bishops, chosen with an eye to their vote for the Whig establishment in the House

26. A Turberville, ed., Johnson's England (Oxford, 1933), vol. 1, pp. 14-38

of Lords, were generally well-educated, able men, but their first obligation was to be in London for the sitting of Parliament. Dioceses were immense, and little notice was taken of the growing cities. Confirmations were often neglected. The sense of well-being and of satisfaction with all things English that followed upon the Glorious Revolution and the Battle of Blenheim was reflected in the religious establishment. "It was snug and smug among the hedgerows, tied up in Elizabethan red tape, smothered under the convention of the establishment, fat with dignities and very scant of breath."²⁷

The Evangelical revival was the major religious movement of the century, but it was in no way dependent upon the traditional structures of the church, emphasizing as it did personal, scriptural holiness. According to A.B. Webster,²⁸

The Evangelical scheme of salvation was well summed up in the characteristic epitaph on John Berridge, Vicar of Everton, which made no reference to the Church amongst all its details about the spiritual life of the departed:
I was born in Sin Feb. 1716,
Remained ignorant of my fallen State till 1730,
Lived proudly on Faith and Works for Salvation till 1754
Admitted to Everton Vicarage 1755
Fled to JESUS alone for Refuge 1756.
Fell asleep in Christ January 22nd 1793.
Needless to say, lack of episcopal government in the Free Churches was no bar to the Vicar of Everton co-operating with them so long as they shared his Evangelical interpretation of Christianity.

John Wesley remained fiercely loyal to the Church of England, and because of his Tory background was willing to involve himself in conflict with his American followers because he opposed their War of Independence. But even he was able to say that he understood himself to be as much a New

²⁷ Carey, p. 86

²⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 86-87

Testament episkopos as any bishop in the Church of England, and so justified his action in ordaining a ministry for his American "sheep in the wilderness" after the war.²⁹

As Sykes puts it, the motto of the Church of England in the eighteenth century was quieta non movere, and here, at least, the bishops were faithful to their consecration vow to be an example to the people.³⁰

3. The Oxford Movement and Beyond

The impact of the Evangelical movement continued into the nineteenth century, and it was one of the forces behind the spiritual revival that came with the 1830's. However, it found no theological deepening to accompany its zeal and ethical earnestness; it tended increasingly to be anti-Catholic and anti-liberal; and it did not flourish as did Methodism (and the evangelical movement in general) in North America. Rather, the spiritual initiative passed to the Tractarians and to that re-emphasis upon the Catholic nature of the Church which came to be called the Oxford Movement.

Though the tracts that Newman, Keble, Froude, and others composed were neither creative in their theology nor innovative in their approach to ecclesiastical polity, they had lasting impact because of their religious depth. Basically, the Oxford Movement was a reassertion of the Church as a mystery, as the possessor of divinely given truth and authority and power to save. Neither this position nor the other elements of Christian faith emphasized by the Tractarians were new to Anglican theology,

29. Letters, J. Telford, ed. (London, 1960), vol. 7, p. 262

30. Turberville, p. 38

yet the attention drawn to them by the Oxford Movement "seriously altered the accepted patterns of Anglican thought and practice."³¹ Along with the Evangelical thrust of the previous century, but with more influence at the very heart of the Anglican church, the Oxford Movement swung the balance away from identification of the Anglican clergy as functionaries of the government and towards their identity and activity as pastors. Moreover, in its emphasis on deepened Christian spirituality and on more careful pastoral training for prospective clergy, the Oxford Movement helped prepare a large body of clergy better equipped for a ministry of word and sacrament.³² One of the key elements in the Tractarian vision of the Church was the centrality of the Eucharistic action, an action which they explained as involving both the presence and the sacrifice of Christ.³³ The "Cambridge movement" was more responsible for the external aspects of liturgical renewal,³⁴ but it was the Eucharistic theology of the Oxford Tractarians that moved a large segment of nineteenth and twentieth century Anglican clergy to think of their ministry in more "priestly" terms.

Fairweather says that "in the long run their doctrine of the eucharistic sacrifice and presence inevitably led to sweeping changes in liturgical usage."³⁵ It may be added for our purposes that those "sweeping changes" were bound to sweep the bishops along with them, not only because of episcopal supervision of liturgical acts, but also because the Trac-

31. E. Fairweather, The Oxford Movement (Oxford, 1964), p. 8

32. See J. Moorman, History of the Church in England (London, 1973), p. 272.

33. See the passages from Wilberforce's Doctrine of the Eucharist (1853), reprinted in Fairweather, pp. 362-67.

34. See J. White, The Cambridge Movement (Cambridge, 1962).

35. Fairweather, p. 12

tarians found it necessary to base the validity of the eucharistic offering upon equally valid ordinations administered by bishops in apostolic succession. Apostolic succession became, in fact, the hinge upon which their whole system swung, thus giving rise to the plethora of polemic, apologetic, and in some cases, sound scholarship on the history and theology of the episcopacy. We will examine some of this material in the next chapter. But as the priests were affected pastorally, so were the bishops; and as some of those priests moved into the ranks of the episcopacy a new dynamic was felt to be at work. It was not that new functions were found for the Anglican episcopate but that the ancient sacerdotal character was re-discovered and employed.³⁶

36. Moorman, pp. 357-60

CHAPTER TWO: THE DEVELOPMENT OF EPISCOPAL IDENTITY

The question now to be considered is how the bishops justified their exercise of authority over the functions described in the first chapter. What was the source of their authority and how did it give them a character lacking in presbyters, deacons, and even emperors? In this chapter we shall examine four ideas or movements that contributed to establishing episcopal "identity": the development of the concept of apostolic succession, the debate over the nature of episcopal orders in relation to presbyteral ordination, the conflict between bishops and pope over jurisdiction, and the influence of the Oxford Movement in developing the prestige and significance of "the historic episcopate" not only among Anglicans but for all those who found themselves in ecumenical conversation with Anglicans in the succeeding years.

1. Apostolic Succession

The doctrine of apostolic succession finds its origin in the early Church's response to the claims of gnosticism to have a special tradition communicated in secret from the apostles and passed on to a privileged few who were able to understand it. The type of "insight" expounded by the various forms of gnosticism implied a radical negation of the faith as the New Testament communities understood it.¹ The essential heritage

1. See H.B. Swete, ed., Essays on the Early History of the Church and the Ministry (London, 1918), pp. 105-08. I am indebted to Prof. R.McL. Wilson for calling attention to a recent theory which maintains that it was disagreement over the meaning of the ministry itself which helped separate the orthodox from the gnostic. See E. Pagels, "'The Demiurge and His Archons' - A Gnostic View of the Bishop and Presbyters," Harvard Theological Review 69 (1976), pp. 301-24.

of Christian revelation was in danger of being lost; Christian communities were consequently in danger of ceasing to be communities of faith in the true mystery of Christ; and the episcopacy found it necessary to assert its communal faith, grounded in continuity with apostolic teaching, as a criterion that could safeguard the authenticity and integrity of the community's belief.

Central to the continuity of Christian faith and life, and to the continuity midst evolution of ecclesiastical office, was the notion of apostolic succession.² It was the original group of Jesus' disciples, especially the Twelve, who had been privileged witnesses to and interpreters of the Christ-event. What they believed in, the saving death and resurrection of Jesus who was therein revealed as Messiah and Lord, was the indispensable object of faith upon which the internally unifying belief of early Christianity depended. If the Christian community of the second or third century was to lay claim legitimately to identity as Christian, then its faith had to agree essentially with that of the early apostles. Origin in apostolic teaching, or at the very least congruence with that teaching, functioned quite explicitly as a norm for establishing canonical New Testament writings³ and for judging the orthodoxy and credentials of those who laid claim to the role of teacher within the community.⁴ Thus Irenaeus could justify his own explanation of Christian belief by pointing out that he had received it from Polycarp who had him-

2. A. Ehrhardt, The Apostolic Succession in the First Two Centuries of the Church (London, 1953)

3. K. Rahner and J. Ratzinger, The Episcopate and the Primacy (Edinburgh, 1962), pp. 46-54

4. Justin's First Apology 10.61 and Didache 11:1-2

self received it from John.⁵ There is abundant and clear evidence that the idea of "apostolic succession" (or, closely allied with it, that of "apostolic tradition"⁶) exerted important influence on the thought and life of the early Christian centuries. What is not so clear is the manner in which this apostolic succession was understood. It is possible that underneath the surface continuity there took place an unrecognized but critically important evolution of meaning.

It seems to have been an unquestioned assumption that in some fashion the teaching of the Twelve, the didache ton apostolon, must provide an abiding yardstick for orthodoxy. Not only was teaching, written or oral, assessed by virtue of its origin in apostolic teaching or because of its conformity (or non-conformity) to such clearly apostolic teaching, but the notion of apostolic tradition, i.e., of instruction and witness coming down in a line of succession from the first followers of Jesus, was formulated into a principle to which the episcopacy could appeal to vindicate the authenticity of their teaching.⁷

Within a relatively short time the collection of writings we know as the New Testament obtained recognition as canonical writing. And studies in the history of the New Testament text leave no doubt that the criterion for inclusion in this corpus of normative literature was the belief that they were derived from apostolic teaching.⁸ We see this attribution to apostolic origin working not only with the accepted canonical literature

5. Hist. Eccl. 5.20.5-7

6. Rahner and Ratzinger, p. 51: "...apostolic tradition and apostolic succession define each other. The succession is the external form of the tradition, and tradition is the content of the succession."

7. R. Hanson, Tradition in the Early Church (London, 1963), pp. 94-117

8. R. Brown, Jerome Biblical Commentary, vol. 2, pp. 525-26

but also in the names attributed to credal or liturgical collections - as Didache Apostolon, Constitutiones Apostolicae, Paradosis Apostolon. However, it was primarily with reference to the books of the New Testament that the teachers of the early Church applied the notion of apostolic tradition, and then used those writings as a basis for their exposition of Christian faith. The use of some New Testament texts as guides to teaching antedates such formal appeal to tradition, and probably antedates the final formulation of the text itself and its acceptance as canonical - one thinks of the writings of Clement of Rome or Justin, or even Irenaeus.⁹

The understanding of "tradition" was not limited to the preservation and exposition of canonical writings, however; it was applied to the activity of bishops and other teachers of the faith. One must be careful first in observing and then evaluating this phenomenon in the early Church. In the earlier stages of the process, it seems quite clear that a given bishop would appeal to the pedagogical fact that he himself had been carefully instructed by his predecessor, who in turn had been instructed by one of the Twelve or at least by one of their original disciples.¹⁰ Thus, the appeal was to a linear transmission of understanding through teaching rather than to a guarantee of trustworthiness because of possession of an office (the episcopacy) by way of traceable linear descent. In such a context, others in the community could equally lay claim to possession of apostolic tradition; but the episcopal "descent"

9. Ibid., pp. 530-31

10. See the letter of Irenaeus to Florinus contained in Eusebius' Hist. eccl. 5.20.5-7.

offered a clear and accessible instance of such a link with the Twelve, thereby certifying not only the faith of the episkopos but that of the community he headed.¹¹

The viewpoint of Irenaeus focused on the function and responsibility of the bishop. "Tradition" was not a sharply defined notion for the bishop of Lyons, but in general it referred to the body of revealed truth that came to the Church from the apostles. It could refer specifically to the kerygma of the apostles or it could denote the faith of Christians.¹² For the most part the term was used in an "objective" sense; it was the revelation given by Christ and perfectly handed down by the apostles. What made the apostles an object of veneration was not their endowment with special charismata, nor their possession of official authority, but their fidelity in witnessing to Christ.

On the other hand, when Irenaeus saw that the episcopate in the Church performs a special role in safeguarding the traditions of faith, he attributed this to a special grace given them because of their apostolic succession.¹³ The action of the Spirit in teaching the truth falls in a special way on the episcopate, that is, on the bishops who are gifted, by virtue of the apostolic succession, with the charisma of truth. The bishops' function seems to be largely one of preserving, fostering, and transmitting the truth of apostolic tradition. And while there is no statement that limits tradition to scripture, there is generally the

11. This seems to have been the mentality behind the action of Hegesippus in going to Rome and Corinth to find the true doctrine in contrast to gnosticism.

12. Hanson, Tradition, pp. 41-46

13. Adv. Haer. 4.40.2; 4.42.1. See Hanson's discussion of these passages, pp. 159-62.

association of scripture with the objective apostolic tradition, and no indication that there is any "revelation" contained in some other source.¹⁴

Though he does in one place say that this apostolic tradition is preserved and transmitted by the successio presbyterorum, the immediately succeeding passage indicates that the bishops are principally (if not exclusively) intended by this term.¹⁵ And it would seem that two factors contribute to the authoritative witness of such episkopoi: the fact that they had heard the faithful witness of their episcopal predecessor who himself had heard it from his predecessor, and so on back to one of the apostles or disciples of Jesus; and the special gift of the Spirit to help them be faithful in their witness to the truth.¹⁶

Tertullian's De praescriptione contains much the same view as that contained in Irenaeus. The Catholic Church is to be followed, for she alone has the authentic scriptures, the doctrine of the apostles, and the apostolic succession. The more he leaned to Montanism, however, the more Tertullian set the Church of the Spirit in opposition to the Church of the Bishops; the witness to truth comes from the "spiritual" man rather than from the bishop.¹⁷

Perhaps the most important quality of the bishop was his "orthodoxy," his possession of a fidelity to the gospel of Jesus Christ.¹⁸ Apostolic succession could be appealed to because it implied a continuity of know-

14. Hanson, pp. 44-46

15. Adv. Haer. 3.2.2 - 3.3.1

16. Ibid., 3.3.3

17. See Hanson's discussion of the meaning of apostolic succession in Tertullian and Irenaeus, pp. 157-62.

18. Titus 2:1-10; Cyprian, De ecclesiae unitate 5

ledge. Thus, the tradition of apostolic faith was carefully and faithfully transmitted; the teaching of the latest member of the chain deserved credence because of his intrinsic correspondence to the faith of the apostle who stood at the beginning of the chain. But the question also has to be faced: Did they envisage an "apostolic office" as such, the establishment (either by the infant Church or by Christ himself) of an official position in the Christian community which was occupied in the first instance by the apostles, and was then occupied later by their legitimate successors?¹⁹

For one thing, the pre-Nicene Church (including its most monarchically-minded episkopoi, such as Ignatius and Cyprian) saw the role and function of the early disciples (and above all, of the apostles) as unique and unrepeatable.²⁰ If they had successors (and in the broad sense they did, since the social entity that began with them continues in historical continuity after their death), these could never occupy the same position the apostles did. There could be only one "founding generation," only one generation of immediate witnesses to the life, death, and resurrection

19. This view, which comes to dominate Catholic theology of the episcopate for many centuries, is adumbrated in I Clem. 42-44. What needs to be assessed is the extent to which I Clem. is already introducing an element of fiction into his description of the apostle's role, and thus setting the stage for later references to the apostolic office. See Goppelt, pp. 177-83.

20. The very fact that the apostolic experience and witness remain the touchstone of authentic Christian faith indicates an abiding recognition of the apostolic uniqueness. This does not preclude, however, the possibility that a collegial group (e.g., the episcopacy) could at a later date in the Church's life perform ~~the same function~~ a unifying and vitalizing function analogous to that performed by the apostolic college for the first Christian generation.

of Jesus, only one group whom the Master himself had taught. Thus, there could be no question of anyone later exercising the "apostolic office."²¹

What one does find stated explicitly is the tradition that the apostles, having established the earliest communities, gave directions that episkopoi and presbyteroi should be appointed to succeed them in caring for the churches.²² Thus there is some notion of an enduring function in a community. The formalizing of this function in political terms, i.e., as an office in a society, seems to have happened first in the African church.

Already in Tertullian, perhaps because of his propensity for legal terminology and categories of thought, one finds traces of this understanding of episcopal "office."²³ But it is worth noting that in his De pudicitia (perhaps his last extant work), he seems to limit apostolic succession to doctrina (disciplina) as a basis for governing and to reserve potestas like that of the apostles (e.g., in forgiving sin) to the charismatics of the Church.²⁴ Without passing judgment on Tertullian's own position on the question, the fact that he discussed the matter in these terms indicates that the idea was already current that some potestas may attach to the episkopos because of his succession from the apostles.

This cast of mind was very congenial to Cyprian, who was largely re-

21. This still leaves open the historical question as to the precise function exercised by the apostles in the primitive Church. For two complementary and somewhat opposed views, see D. Stanley, "The New Testament Basis for the Concept of Collegiality," Theological Studies 25 (1964), pp. 197-216, and W. Schmithals, The Office of Apostle in the Early Church (Nashville, Tenn., 1969).

22. There is no evidence for this view prior to I Clem.; see Goppelt, pp. 182, 199.

23. von Campenhausen, pp. 225-37

24. De pudicitia 21

sponsible for crystallizing a "political" understanding of the episcopal office, which was then transmitted to the post-Nicene Church through Augustine, Leo, and Isidore.²⁵ However, Cyprian's own view (as well as that of his disciples) of episcopal authority must be examined in terms of another basic question: Even granting that episcopacy is an office and its occupant has the authority appropriate to that office, does such authority come through the office itself (by one or other kind of "lineal descent") or directly from God on the occasion of occupying the office? To put it another way, is the de jure divino authority to which bishops will appeal the result of an original grant of authority (to an apostle) to which they are heirs, or the result of a power given directly to each succeeding generation (a vertical rather than horizontal grant of authority)? It would seem that the second alternative (the direct grant from God) is more dominant in the first three centuries. This in turn seems linked with another idea: that Christ himself abides with his Church, working actively and authoritatively through his ministers.²⁶ Actually, then, it is he who is functioning "officially" "behind the scenes," and the bishop is acting as Christ's sacrament.²⁷

25. On Cyprian's use of political terminology when speaking of the episcopacy, see von Campenhausen, p. 274, esp. nn. 45, 46.

26. It must be admitted, however, that there is relatively little in Cyprian's writings that reflects this "Christ abiding with his Church" idea. In what should be key passages in the De ecclesiae unitate there is much more of the attitude that "Christ has gone up to heaven," and it seems that Cyprian's view is rather that Christians should dwell in the heavenly kingdom (even during their life on earth) than that Christ dwells with Christians on earth. However, Cyprian clearly and frequently refers to the Church's guidance by the Spirit through the scriptures.

27. This point of view seems to fade somewhat in the third century and even more so in the fourth and fifth centuries, perhaps because of the trinitarian controversies and the need to emphasize the transcendence of Christ as Son of God.

With the triumph of monarchical episcopacy the question of how the succession is transmitted became more urgent and one sees a tendency towards uniformity in the process by which bishops were chosen and consecrated. We have already examined the rite urged by Hippolytus in the early third century. Canons of the early fourth century indicate that an established pattern of episcopal consecration was recognized.²⁸

While the preferred situation was that all the bishops of a given metropolitan area share in the ordination of the new bishop, at least three should participate in the ceremony. There is no clear evidence that the reality of the ordination was conditioned by the presence of three consecrators; ordination by a single fellow bishop was recognized.²⁹

But it does seem that they were interested in preserving a collegial sacramentality in the action. Episcopal consecration, where a candidate was being received into the episcopal community, whose corporate identity and function had already been emphasized by Cyprian,³⁰ was quite different in its orientation from presbyteral ordinations where from the fifth century onward a bishop was seen as designating ministers to work with him in the shepherding of the local community.³¹

28. J. Palanque et al., The Church in the Christian Roman Empire (London, 1952), vol. 2, pp. 600-03

29. The Synod of Riez (439) did nullify a consecration in which there were only two consecrating bishops; but there were other "irregularities" as well: lack of consenting letters from other bishops of the province and lack of accord with the metropolitan. On the other hand, the Irish practice until well into the Middle Ages was for a single bishop to function as episcopal consecrator. See W. Bright, The Age of the Fathers (London, 1903), vol. 2, pp. 419-20.

30. De eccl. unitate 5

31. B. Botte, "Collegiate Character of the Presbyterate and Episcopate," The Sacrament of Holy Orders (Collegeville, Minn., 1962), pp. 75-97;

D. Power, Ministers of Christ and His Church (London, 1969), pp. 53-88

No matter how the nomination of the episcopal candidate took place, by community selection, episcopal designation, or choice by the metropolitan or patriarch (with or without pressure from temporal rulers), there was never any question of his being able to exercise episcopal functions or lay claim to episcopal authority prior to his sacramental consecration.³² Once the episcopatus came to mean in large part the economic holdings and responsibility of the bishop, the bishop-designate could lay claim to the jurisdiction necessary to carry on these temporal elements of his role even prior to his episcopal consecration. Even this was seen as an exceptional and temporary measure which was allowed because of practical demands.³³ And there is no evidence that any bishop attempted to exercise the principal episcopal ministries of word, sacrament, or ecclesiastical government without being ordained.

So much is clear. What is not clear is the manner in which this episcopal ordination was seen as the source of episcopal authority. One element was the official recognition from the rest of the episcopate that this individual occupied the cathedra and therefore the office that

32. For an interesting discussion of the relationship between the ceremonies of consecration and installation of a bishop, see W. Telfer, The Office of a Bishop (London, 1962), pp. 187-208. Separation of these two actions, clearly apparent in the case of consecrating an auxiliary bishop or in the transfer of a bishop from one see to another, raises basic questions about the nature of episcopacy: Is it essentially the possession of more power (which the consecration of an auxiliary seems to indicate) or is it the leadership of a community (which the installation ceremony stresses)?

33. On the canonical discussions relative to the rights and role of the bishop-designate, a matter that was complicated by the early medieval absorption of the episcopal office into the feudal structure, see R. Benson, The Bishop-Elect (Princeton, N.J., 1968)

was apostolic in origin and authority.³⁴ Another element, as we can tell from the ordination formulae, was the gift of the Spirit, conferred upon the ordinand through the agency of his fellow bishops, the divine source of his episcopal authority and power.³⁵ It seems, too, that the ordination of the bishop was seen as an incorporation into the collegial body of bishops, a sharing in the dignity and responsibility and power which they corporately possessed.

The bishops of the early centuries were generally successful in establishing the episcopal personality as being apostolic and in forming the source of their identity and authority from the genealogical tables of the apostolic sees. But they soon faced another crisis and conflict. We have seen that as early as Irenaeus it was maintained that the apostolic tradition was preserved through the successio presbyterorum. As the presbyterate became more closely identified with the sacerdotal ministry that had earlier been the province of the bishop alone, questions began to be asked concerning what intrinsic difference, if any, existed between the two orders, and the bishops were faced with the concept of the parity of ministers. We need now to examine this second issue in the development of episcopal identity.

2. Presbyterate and Episcopate: Orders or Degrees?

One aspect of the ministry in the pre-Nicene Church that needs to

34. The shift in the symbolism of the cathedra, from its earlier connection with preaching and liturgical leadership to the later accretion of reference to monarchical jurisdiction, reflects the shift in thought about the episcopal office.

35. See Appendix B, line 13.

be examined is this: What was the nature of the authority that attached to ministry? In a later age we could ask this simply of the episcopacy, since by that time other orders were considered to derive all their authority from the bishops, but this cannot be done for the early Church. For a time, at least, the presbyterate had a somewhat independent even though a subordinate authority, an authority not derived by delegation from the episcopacy.³⁶ One finds evidence for this as late as Hippolytus, where grounds such as confession of faith in persecution can dispense with ordination to the presbyterate.³⁷ And Cyprian himself complained about the assumption of authority by presbyters, which he saw as unfounded, but which may not have been viewed by them as such.³⁸

This presbyteral authority seems to stem from various factors which gave some individuals an eminence in the community. They might be age and experience, or observable fidelity in faith and Christian practice, or endurance of persecution, or (in the instance of newly founded communities) being among the first converts in a given church, the "first fruits" of the Spirit's action in that community. With such recognized eminence came extra responsibility for the faith and life of the community, a certain implicit grant of authority to participate effectively in providing for the community, and the right to be listened to by the epis-

36. The presbyters were not thought of as derived from the episcopacy but as part of the same collegium to which the bishop himself pertained; it is highly unlikely that the bishop by himself would have selected the presbyters. See Power, pp. 31-41. A somewhat different situation did prevail for the deacons, however, since they were "the bishop's men;" Didascalia, chap. 16, quite specifically refers to episcopal appointment of the deacons.

37. A.T., 10:1

38. Epist. 16

kopos if such existed in the community.³⁹

In the early Church, such presbyteral authority was not the result of episcopal delegation. However, this body of responsible Christians was the most logical group upon which to draw if there was need to supply in the absence of the episkopos for those functions which were more properly his, such as providing baptism and Eucharist. When they functioned in these substitute capacities, the presbyteroi would have been sharing in the bishop's authority; yet it is interesting, and perhaps important, to recall that for many centuries it was the diakonoi and not the presbyteroi who were referred to as the ministers of the bishop.⁴⁰

One thing that is not clear but that is basic to any historical study of Christian priesthood is whether or not the notion of "priestly office" attaches primarily to the presbyterate and thereby to the episkopos as the preeminent member of the presbyterate. The historical data which indicates that the word hiereus or sacerdos, once it began to be used of Christian ministry, applied for quite some time only to the bishop would seem to argue against the above suggestion.⁴¹ However, it would be necessary to study whether this application of sacerdos to the bishop is not part of the process of re-Judaizing Christian thinking about priest-

39. Cyprian, Epist. 14, writing to the presbyters and deacons of his church, says, "...From the beginning of my episcopate, I determined to do nothing on the basis of my own opinion alone, without your advice and the consent of the people."

40. This is reflected yet in most ordination ceremonies: only the bishop lays his hands on the deacon, whereas fellow bishops impose hands on a new bishop and fellow presbyters on a new presbyter. An important exception is now to be found in the Church of South India; see Chapter 4.

41. An argument favoring the "insertion" of the bishop as priest within the presbyteral college is provided by the Apostolic Tradition which speaks of both bishop and presbyters as being ordained for priesthood (whereas the deacon is not so ordained), but the argument is not conclusive.

hood and losing the primitive Christian insight into the unique ministry of Christ and of his Church.

Beginning as early as the late second century, the Old Testament notion of priesthood wielded a considerable influence on the manner in which priestly office and ministry were viewed.⁴² Christian priesthood is not only like Old Testament priesthood, it actually finds its origins in the latter. It is quite different, however, for Christ was a priest according to the "order of Melchizedek." Granted this difference, bishops trace their origins from the high priests, priests from the other priests, deacons from the Levites; and another "lineage" sees the bishops deriving from the apostles, the priests from the disciples, the deacons from the deacons of Acts.

Such reference to Old Testament priesthood gradually emphasized the idea of the priest as "offering sacrifice," and the power to consecrate the Eucharistic oblation took on an increasing centrality in thought about the priestly office.⁴³ Whereas discussion about the episcopacy's possession of "the keys" tended to center of exegesis of Matthew 16:18 (and related texts) and the claim to the grant made to Peter and the other apostles, discussion about the presbyteral power to absolve sin tended to derive this power from the more ultimate and greater power of Eucharistic consecration; since they possess the greater power, a for-

42. See Y. Congar, "Two Factors in the Sacralization of Western Society During the Middle Ages," Sacralization and Secularization in the History of the Church (New York, 1968), pp. 28-31.

43. See IV, 8-9 (p. 254) in R. Reynolds, "A Florilegium on the Ecclesiastical Grades in CLM 19414: Testimony to Ninth-Century Clerical Instruction," Harvard Theological Review 63 (1970); this passage indicates that by the ninth century or earlier the consecratio sacrificii was viewed as the basic sacerdotal action.

tiori the lesser.

By the ninth century any "political" voice the presbyterate may have had was limited to opposing the practical decisions of a given bishop, and at times appealing over his head to the pope, as happened with Hincmar of Reims,⁴⁴ but it was gaining a subtle triumph regarding the understanding and theology of priesthood. Whereas in an earlier age the term sacerdos was practically a proper denomination for the bishop, it now became increasingly associated with the presbyter.⁴⁵ Theological and polemical discussion of the episcopal role, because of accelerating Roman claims, centered more and more on the jurisdictional and authoritative aspects of the bishop's activity, trying to establish what is proper to him in this sphere. As a result, the right to preach, teach, celebrate the Eucharist, and forgive sins was no longer associated properly with the episcopal office but with the priesthood which the presbyter (and also the bishop) possesses by virtue of ordination. The liturgical formulae for presbyteral and episcopal ordination, retaining the formulations of the past, preserved the episcopacy's claim to being "the basic priestly order."⁴⁶ But in common understanding, and in theological discussion, the notion became more and more common that a bishop

44. See E. Duckett, Carolingian Portraits (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1962), pp. 202-58.

45. As early as the eighth century in the listing of ecclesiastical offices in the Collectio Hibernensis, "sacerdos" was used as a distinctive term for the presbyterate: "Episcopum decet judicare et interpretari et consecrare et consummare et ordinare et baptizare et offerre; sacerdotum autem oportet offerre et benedicere et bene praeesse, praedicare et baptizare" (Reynolds, p. 240).

46. The same formulae for priestly ordination and episcopal consecration are used in the Roman Ordinal around 750 and in the Gregorian, Gelasian, and Leonine Sacramentaries. See Power, pp. 70-78.

is "a priest with the additional power to ordain priests." Theologians tried to distinguish the episcopate from the presbyterate by saying that the bishop has the fullness of what the presbyter has, and they asked the question (more commonly with a negative response): Is episcopacy an order distinct from that of the presbyter?⁴⁷ In such discussions the influence of Jerome's position seems to have been quite important.

The distinction (or non-distinction) of episcopacy as an order is one of the persistent questions that one encounters in the theological discussions of the Middle Ages. Contrary to the opinion of earlier periods and to the patristic overshadowing of presbyterate by episcopacy, the medieval theologians saw the essence and loftiest powers of priesthood being conferred in presbyteral ordination.⁴⁸ The bishop is what a presbyter is, only a little more so - he can ordain, and his power of the keys extends to the realm of excommunication.⁴⁹ So, for the most part, they did not see episcopacy as a distinct order.

In a sense, this was a logical conclusion from the emphasis placed on the Eucharist as the changing of bread into Christ and therefore on the priestly power of transubstantiating. Not that pastoral concerns vanished, but priesthood as a cultic reality gradually gained center

47. See A. McDevitt, "The Episcopate as an Order and Sacrament on the Eve of the High Scholastic Period," Franciscan Studies 20 (1960), pp. 96-148.

48. Hugh of St. Victor, De sacramentis 2.3.11; Thomas Aquinas, In Sent. 4, d. 23, q. 1, a. 3, qa. 3

49. Hugh of St. Victor, 2.3.12; Thomas Aquinas, Summa theol. 3, q. 82, a. 1, ad 4

stage in preference to apostolic proclamation of the gospel.⁵⁰ Relationship of bishops to the apostles had become a polemical argument for jurisdiction rather than a sacramental making present of the apostolic tradition.⁵¹

As part of the attempt to distinguish what was proper to all priests as priests from what pertained only to the episcopacy, there developed in clear and constantly used form the distinction between potestas ordinis and potestas jurisdictionis.⁵² This was not a distinction that was new to the Middle Ages,⁵³ but it was theologically formulated and employed during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries,⁵⁴ became a basic principle of understanding during the fourteenth and fifteenth century disputes on the relative power of pope and council,⁵⁵ and is important in the polem-

50. This is reflected in medieval canon law, in which the bishop (and more so the pope) is seen as a sacred monarch, possessing the fullness of the keys and the fullness of the potestas ordinis. See Ullmann, pp. 7-8.

51. Dominant as symbolism was in medieval understanding of the Church (e.g., Hugh of St. Victor's De sacramentis), the emphasis was on cosmic ahistorical symbolism rather than on historical symbolism. This is reflected in the fascination with the allegorical meaning of the Bible. It may also have been reflected in the popes' assuming the title of "vicar of Christ" rather than the earlier papal predilection for "vicar of Peter." See Ullmann, p. 280.

52. Obviously, application of this distinction was complicated by the intertwining of ecclesiastical and civil authority. It was further complicated by the increasing autonomy of the laity in secular pursuits (where they were outside the realm of the potestas ordinis and where they felt ever less need to acknowledge any clerical potestas jurisdictionis) and by the rapid expansion of the mendicant orders.

53. See G. Dix, Jurisdiction in the Early Church (London, 1975).

54. M. Wilks, The Problem of Sovereignty in the Later Middle Ages (Cambridge, 1963), pp. 354-407.

55. B. Tierney, Foundations of the Conciliar Theory (Cambridge, 1955)

ics about the relative and interlocking jurisdiction of pope and king.⁵⁶ Bishops were seen as possessing a greater power of jurisdiction by virtue of their ability to ordain and to excommunicate, but episcopal consecration added nothing to their power to confection the Eucharist, a power they had received in presbyteral ordination. In this supreme action of priesthood, the confection of the Eucharist, there was no distinction between bishops and presbyters; this was the principle from which most medieval thinkers drew the conclusion that episcopacy is not a distinct order.⁵⁷

The medieval debates provided the necessary material to justify the establishment of presbyterianism at the Reformation. Even in those churches which maintained an episcopacy in Lutheranism it was usually seen as a functional superintendency and not as a higher order.⁵⁸ It is significant that even in England where there was every attempt made to perpetuate the threefold division of the ministry, the 1549 Prayer Book spoke of "Ordering of Deacons" and "Ordering of Priests," but of the "Consecrating of an Archbishop or Bishop." It was not until 1661

56. Two stages in this dispute should be distinguished. In the earlier stage, the context is the one populus christianus in which two authorities (two swords) interact and in which there is question about pope and emperor being two parallel possessors of jurisdiction (spiritual and temporal). In the second stage (from the fifteenth century onward), with rising nationalism making the Holy Roman Empire more of an empty symbol, the pope is in the matter of potestas jurisdictionis secularis a sovereign among peers. In the first stage the discussion of papal potestas is more juridico-theological, in the second stage more politico-philosophical. See A. Black, Monarchy and Community (Cambridge, 1970), pp. 53-84.

57. "...Ordinatur omnis ordo ad Eucharistiae sacramentum. Unde cum episcopus non habeat potestatem^{tem} superiorem sacerdote quantum ad hoc, episcopatus non erit ordo" (Thomas Aquinas, Summa theol., Suppl., q. 40, a. 5).

58. E. Schlöcker, Theology of the Lutheran Confessions (Philadelphia, 1960), pp. 238-51

as a result of the strife about parity of ministers that the Prayer Book changed the title to include the word "ordaining" in the service for the consecration of bishops. It may simply be maintained that Cranmer used the term he did because consecratio is found in the corresponding place in the Sarum Rite. Still one might ask why the medieval preference for consecratio when applied to the ordination of bishops. Does it at least suggest a hesitancy in the mind of the Church about what was happening in the service?⁵⁹

The Roman response to the Protestant criticisms of the evolution that the concept of ministry had undergone since the early Church was to re-emphasize the primacy of the sacrificing priest and the centrality of the cultic aspects of the faith. Because of the complicated relationships between pope and episcopate which we will consider in the next section, the Council of Trent did not pronounce any new dogmas about the

59. It is interesting to observe how American episcopal Methodism corrected the usage recommended by John Wesley in order to preserve the very distinction he had made in theory but compromised in practice. Wesley, on the basis of his presbyteral orders, maintained he had a right to ordain ministers to meet the need of the former colonies, particularly since the Church of England bishops refused to do so. However, he ordained as "superintendent" Thomas Coke, already in presbyteral orders in the Church of England. By his own logic he could not give Coke anything more than he already had! But Wesley then sent to the American societies a recension of the Prayer Book Ordinal which included "The Form of Ordaining of a Superintendent." Wesley would not use the word "bishop," possibly an indication of his own insecurity about his action, but he inconsistently struck out "or Consecrating" from the Prayer Book title. The Americans, in 1792, changed "superintendent" to "bishop," and then to emphasize that their episcopacy was presbyteral changed "ordaining" to "consecrating" in 1864. In 1884 they added an explanatory rubric at the beginning of the service:

This service is not to be understood as an ordination to a higher Order in the Christian Ministry, beyond and above that of Elders or Presbyters, but as a solemn and fitting Consecration for the special and most sacred duties of Superintendency in the Church.

ministry, being content to promulgate disciplinary decrees with the intent of forming a more effective and better trained ministry. The Council reaffirmed that the episcopate contained the fullness of the priesthood,⁶⁰ but it did not attempt to resolve the debate about the difference, if any, between order and degree, and so the question was left open for theological discussion.

In discussing the relationship of bishops and presbyters and the question of whether episcopacy is a distinct order, Robert Bellarmine appealed to the principle that the sacrament of orders is finalized by the Eucharist, and said that the highest power of ordained priests (presbyters and bishops) is that of the Eucharistic consecration.⁶¹ Another insight into his view of episcopate and presbyterate as more or less of the same thing comes with his statement that episcopate, if it were conferred upon one who had not previously been ordained presbyter, would contain presbyterate within itself.⁶² Episcopate and presbyterate together form one ordained priesthood, but episcopate is more eminent than presbyterate and its source.

Since Thomas Aquinas' explanation of Christian priesthood had been so influential in shaping the doctrinal formulations of Florence and Trent, the more competent commentators on Aquinas in any century give a reliable presentation of the classic and officially acceptable theology. In the eighteenth century, no theologian in this tradition of Thomistic commentary was more prominent than Billuart nor a greater influence on

60. Power, pp. 122-24

61. De sacramento ordinis, chap. 5

62. Ibid.

subsequent Thomistic thought.⁶³ This Belgian Dominican, in his treatment of the sacrament of orders, followed the standard teaching that a double power is given in ordination: the power touching the real body of Christ in the Eucharistic consecration and the power touching the mystical body of Christ. Thus, though the essence of priesthood as such deals with sacrifice, the priesthood of the new law instituted by Christ is directed both to sacrifice and to judgment: the Christian priest is sacrificer and judge. The highest power that can be given to man is that over the body of Christ in Eucharistic consecration; it far surpasses the power over the mystical body of Christ. Thus, though a bishop has the fullness of this latter power, the episcopacy is not clearly a distinct order but rather the fullness of the sacerdotium. However, Billuart maintained that bishops are, by divine institution, superior to presbyters both in power of orders and power of jurisdiction.

Trent and subsequent theologians did not wholly put to rest the questions in such a decisive way as to afford the bishops no further agonizing over either their identity or their jurisdiction. A most striking instance of presbyterianism in the Roman church was that which developed in the lower clergy of France in the eighteenth century and was associated with the Richerist movement, which found expression in the Civil Constitution of the Clergy (in 1790), and which was an important element in the ferment leading up to the Revolution.⁶⁴ Rooted in the Gallican theories of Edmond Richer, an early seventeenth century canon-

63. L. Flynn, Billuart and His Summa Sancti Thomae (London, Canada, 1938)

64. See A. Goodwin, New Cambridge Modern History (Cambridge, 1961), vol. 8, pp. 686-90; and J. McManners, The French Revolution and the Church (London, 1969), pp. 15-18.

ist at the Sorbonne, but going beyond him in its emphasis on the prerogatives and autonomy of the lower clergy, eighteenth century Richerism became both a theological exaltation of the presbyterate and a practical effort to better the economic, social, and political situation of the lower clergy.⁶⁵ This "revolt of the cures" reached its zenith in 1789 when the parish clergy outnumbered the bishops in the Estates General 208-46. What might have been the result of this new possession of power in a calmer situation is impossible to say; as it was, France was already rushing towards the upheaval of the Revolution, and the Constituent Assembly's framing of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy and its imposition on all office-holding clergy in France led to a disastrous division within the clergy, the church, and the country as a whole.⁶⁶

The conflict concerning the nature of presbyteral and episcopal orders was won in Protestantism by the presbyterians (allowing for some difference of opinion among the Anglicans). In the Roman church the question was left open, but with the understanding that regardless of the status of presbyters the bishops did in fact possess the fullness of the sacrament of orders. We have seen that in the Middle Ages, in an attempt to answer the question, the bishops had recourse to the distinction between potestas ordinis and potestas jurisdictionis. It is not surprising that this would be called into use, because it was also being employed as a defence by the bishops in their war on another front - that against the increasing authority of the pope. But while they used it from one angle against the presbyterate in order to maintain their

65. McManners, pp. 15-18

66. McManners, pp. 19-79

own authority, they had to use it from the opposite end if they were to be successful against the pope. We must now examine how they waged that other war, nor should we be surprised to discover that it was impossible to emerge victorious on both fronts.

3. Episcopal-Papal Conflict

Prior to Nicaea there is no evidence whatsoever that the bishop of Rome claimed to be the source of authority for his brother bishops, nor that any other bishop thought Rome to be the source of his authority.⁶⁷ There is some evidence that Rome had a special preeminence, even that it was the guardian of orthodox faith in a special way, but there is no evidence that the bishop of Rome was the source of episcopal authority.

During the fourth and fifth century flowering of patristic thought there was great respect for the doctrinal and spiritual eminence of the Roman church. Above all, from the point of view of evidence for Roman primacy, there was the attestation at Chalcedon to the Petrine succession of Leo I: "Peter speaks through the mouth of Leo."⁶⁸ Yet there is no evidence that the bishop of Rome played any greater role in the selec-

67. Probably the most disputed case is that of Cyprian, with much of the dispute focusing on the variant textual traditions for De ecclesiae unitate 4; however, even the "longer version" of this work seems to point to the symbolic function of Peter's primacy - he is the sign of episcopal unity - rather than to any jurisdictional superiority. The text states that it is Christ who extends to the other apostles the power he had first given to Peter; as a result they have the same status and power.

68. However, one must be careful not to read too much into this conciliar statement. There is considerable evidence that indicates that it was a somewhat hollow gesture that was contradicted by the council's rejection of practically all of Leo's instructions for the council. See K. Morrison, Tradition and Authority in the Western Church (Princeton, N.J., 1969), pp. 66-68.

tion and empowering of bishops in his own patriarchate than did any other patriarch; he played no such role in other patriarchates. Nor does it seem that bishops within a given patriarchate, including that of Rome, felt that they derived their authority from the ruling patriarch.⁶⁹

With the pontificate of Gelasius, at the very end of the fifth century, a new orientation of thought began. At least to some extent in reaction to the claims of Byzantine rulers, Gelasius laid claim for the papacy to ultimate spiritual power. The basileus might have supreme authority in the temporal sphere, but even the basileus fell under the authority of the pope in "the kingdom of heaven." Gelasius did not draw the conclusion from his claim as it would affect the origin of episcopal power, but the principle had been enunciated, and it was only a matter of time before the logic of the Gelasian view would be made explicit.

The occasion and stimulus for such explication came with the events surrounding Charlemagne's rise to power and with the beginnings of "Christian imperialism" in the West. Gregory the Great had already (after Gelasius) asserted the primacy of Roman authority in the Western church; his use of the term "servus servorum Dei" reflected his claim to universal cura animarum.⁷⁰ Then with the Carolingian ascendancy there came the need to give some further clarification of the relative claims of pope and

69. Isidore of Seville, for example, despite his great admiration and respect for Gregory I, gives no indication that he thinks his own episcopal authority to be derivative from or dependent upon the pope.

70. W. Ullmann (New Catholic Encyclopedia, vol. 10, p. 954) sees Gregory I, without conceding the theoretical claims of Roman primacy, turning pragmatically to the West and laying the foundations for papal dominance of Latin medieval Christianity.

king. As the latter claimed to be the possessor of God-given authority over all things imperial, so the pope was the possessor of God-given authority over all things ecclesiastical, most critically over all things episcopal.⁷¹

Such a claim to be the source of authority for the episcopacy of the West (which was all that practically concerned Rome for the moment) found support in the commonly accepted view that all apostolic and consequent episcopal authority stemmed from the grant of authority given to Peter. Yet prominent bishops of Carolingian times, Hincmar of Reims for one, acknowledged a primatial authority in the bishop of Rome but opposed the Roman claim to being the fountainhead of episcopal authority. This opposition continued through the eleventh century, even under the reigns of Gregory VII and Urban II, though the bishops who at that time found themselves arrayed against the pope seemed to lack the incipient theology of episcopal collegiality which Hincmar possessed and moved more in the realm of "power politics." On the other hand, the papal "legists" and theologians had gradually developed a consistent hierocratic theory which embraced not just the ecclesiastical structures but the entirety of societas christiana.⁷² All that was lacking by the beginning of the twelfth century was a metaphysical justification, a religious cosmology which would rationalize the claims already made by Rome on the basis of the "traditions" of the past. Such would come with Innocent III.

Secular domination of the ecclesiastical institutions, particularly

71. Charlemagne himself pays constant tribute to the normative position of the Roman church, but still asserts his authority over the episcopacy. See Ullmann, Papal Government, pp. 110-11.

72. Ullmann, Papal Government, pp. 359-446

of the clergy, could proceed as far as it did because of the almost total inefficiency of the papacy in the tenth century. By the end of the century things had started to change for the better; the impact of Cluny was increasingly felt, the first of a series of reforming popes, Gerbert (Sylvester II), was on the papal throne. By mid-century the movement of reform was in full swing, supported by many strong and influential figures, like Peter Damian, but dominated by the crusading zeal of Gregory VII, both before and during his reign as pope.

Gregory VII's efforts were directed principally to freeing the church from the lay investiture which threatened to shackle it.⁷³ Above all, he worked to reclaim for the church the selection of its bishops. However, in the struggle to keep the secular power out of spiritual affairs Gregory proceeded by way of exalting the authority and power of the papacy. One needs only to read through the Dictatus papae to see how absolute was the claim of Gregory to papal pre-eminence, both in the church and in human society as a whole.⁷⁴

The papal claim to immediate jurisdiction over all Christians was exercised practically by Gregory VII, who had no hesitation in intervening in matters of dispute in any diocese.⁷⁵ More than that, he revoked some of the traditional rights of bishops; and to carry out his reform

73. For differing interpretations of this conflict, see The Investiture Controversy, ed. K. Morrison (New York, 1971), pp. 1-67.

74. E.g., "Quod solus Romanus pontifex jure dicatur universalis.... Quod ille solus possit deponere episcopos vel reconciliare.... Quod illi licet imperatores deponere.... Quod a nemine ipse judicari debeat."

75. Gregory, however, was no innovator in this regard. Movements of reform, spearheaded by Roman reformers, particularly Gregory's predecessor Nicholas II, had almost of necessity to oppose and interfere with the irregularities of procedure in many dioceses. See Ullmann, Papal Government, p. 281, n. 3.

measures, which not all the episcopacy favored, he sent his own legates (with plenipotentiary powers) into various key spots. It was the action of an absolute monarch, which was what Gregory VII claimed to be,⁷⁶ though it must be granted, from the best evidence we have, that it was motivated by no selfish search for power but only by total dedication to the reform of the church.

Since the Latin church's understanding of episcopacy would, from this point forward, be strongly influenced by the consolidation of Rome's claims to ultimate and uncontested authority, it is necessary to examine theologically the sources of these claims. Such an examination will not settle the issues, but it will at least put the student in a better position to evaluate the hierocratic view of the Roman church developed by medieval European Christianity.

First of all, it should be remarked that Gregory VII was no innovator as far as the theory of papal authority was concerned. Long before his reign as pope, actually long before the eleventh century, the position of absolute papal authority had been worked out theoretically; Gregory VII was the one who was able to implement concretely what had been the Roman position on the topic for many centuries.⁷⁷ Leo I, Gelasius, Gregory I, Nicholas I, John VIII - all had added their bit to developing the position that all authority had been given to Peter, and since the pope functioned as Peter's vicar this same power belonged to him.⁷⁸

To a great extent, the doctrine of absolute Roman authority was a

76. Ullmann, Papal Government, pp. 271-97

77. Ibid., p. 271

78. Gratsch, pp. 41-62

Roman doctrine, resulting chiefly from statements on the topic made by bishops of Rome. Certainly, there had been from earliest times a recognition of pre-eminence, even in some sense of a "primacy," attaching to the apostolic see. Rome was looked to as an exemplar⁷⁹ Christian community, as one whose faith was guaranteed by the promise made to Peter (Luke 22:32).⁷⁹ But the shift of this to an exercise of legislative and judicial governance over Christian moral behavior and ecclesiastical practice was something the earlier centuries had not known, and that the portions of the Church outside immediate Roman influence did not readily admit as something pertaining to essential (or even correct) Christian teaching.⁸⁰ That is why it was centuries after its explicit and detailed formulation that the Roman view was finally imposed on the Latin church by the administrative zeal and firmness of Gregory VII, and after him Urban II and Innocent III.⁸¹

It would be incorrect to assume that these "Roman traditions" were produced solely by Roman decree. A large portion of the traditional statements appealed to by the popes were decrees of their predecessors, but there were also a considerable number of other statements that helped make up the developing canonical tradition: canons of synods and coun-

79. Irenaeus, Adv. Haer. 3.3.2. The Petrine promises apply to the Roman church because Peter continues as Rome's bishop, acting through his vicar (the present incumbent in the Roman episcopacy).

80. Even a strong ally of Rome like Isidore of Seville held that the bishops all had equal power, just as the Twelve had equal power with Peter, though he was granted it first; see De eccles. officiis 2.5.5-6.

81. This is not to suggest that no further theoretical delineation of the papal position took place; on the contrary, the rise of canon law as a discipline in the twelfth century led to an impressive body of legal writing on papal prerogatives. See Ullmann, Papal Government, pp. 359-446.

cils, and the judgments of fathers of the Church (e.g., Augustine, Ambrose, Jerome), to mention the two most widely employed.

One of the constant elements in this hierocratic argumentation is the appeal to Matthew 16:18, the gift of "the keys" to Peter. It is interesting to trace the exegesis of this text (interesting, too, the way in which it gradually eclipses Luke 22:32, which had also been commonly applied to the Roman prerogatives in earlier centuries). The argument never loses sight of the text's application to the context of penitential reconciliation (or excommunication), but its application is extended far beyond this to embrace all authority, all judgment.⁸²

Considerable attention is also given to the text "Behold here are two swords" from the time of Gelasius onward, though it is only with Bernard of Clairvaux that one encounters the explicit theory of the "two swords."⁸³

Appeal to the fathers was based on the notion of auctoritas as it was already beginning to emerge and to influence theological reasoning. For one thing, a writer was considered to have "authority" in proportion as he was ancient, closer to the time of Christ.⁸⁴ One finds some of the fathers treated practically as "word of God" along with scripture, something that finds no critical appraisal or justification until Anselm and Abelard. Moreover, the selection of fathers (and even of the writings of those fathers) was very limited; many of the most influential and important writings of the patristic period were unknown throughout much, if

82. On the linked emergence of penitential discipline and official jurisdiction in the third and fourth centuries, see von Campenhausen, pp. 265-92.

83. Gratsch, pp. 73-74

84. On the late patristic and medieval use of auctores, see M.-D. Chenu, Toward Understanding St. Thomas (Chicago, 1964), pp. 126-34.

not all, of the Middle Ages. Augustine, of course, was most influential; But Gregory I and Isidore, Jerome, Cyprian, and Ambrose also figured frequently in patristic citation - and commonly the citations were drawn from the catenae and florilegia of the day.⁸⁵

Increasingly, the appeal was made to the evolving canonical tradition; but this, too, was selective. There was a fair amount of contradiction in canonical judgments over the centuries; even the papal decretals did not always seem to be perfectly consonant. And it was not until the Decretum of Gratian in the twelfth century that some harmony was established in the midst of this vast and partially contradictory material. But in the meantime some criterion was needed to decide what was truly tradition and what was not, and in this situation Rome and its traditions served as the touchstone.⁸⁶ Thus, in the collections that prevailed and that guided the hierocratic theory which prepared for Gregory VII, those documents were retained that agreed with the Roman posture.

There was not whole-hearted acceptance by the episcopacy of the Roman view, and one must be careful in reading their acknowledgement of Roman primacy not to read it in the light of Vatican I. Even one as well-disposed towards Rome as Isidore of Seville did not treat the pope as having jurisdiction over him. It is the Pseudo-Isidorian writings to which Roman apologists later appeal!⁸⁷ Again, at the height of the Carolingian per-

85. Chenu, St. Thomas, p. 139

86. Ullmann, Papal Government, pp. 361-65

87. Contrary to Isidore himself, who is a mediator to the Middle Ages of the Cyprianic tradition on episcopal prerogatives, Pseudo-Isidore, while exalting the hierarchy, gives clear jurisdictional primacy to Rome. "The primacy of the Roman Church is, next to ecclesiastical freedom from lay jurisdiction, the most vital principle with which Pseudo-Isidore operates" (Ullmann, Papal Government, p. 182).

iod, Hincmar illustrates the position of genuine episcopal respect for Rome with an accompanying resistance to Rome's abolition of long-standing episcopal prerogatives.⁸⁸ Even in the midst of the Hildebrandian campaign, when it required considerable stamina to risk the excommunication and other sanctions that emanated with easy frequency from the Roman curia, bishops (like William Bona Anima, archbishop of Rouen) did resist the pope's abrogation of episcopal rights.⁸⁹

It is difficult to measure the degree of episcopal agreement or disagreement with the theory and policy of the "reforming" popes in the eleventh century. After all, they were not invited to pass theoretical judgment upon the theological validity of the papal view; they were given the alternatives of complying with the papal directives or facing serious reprisal. What was being invoked, at least partially, was papal power rather than the intrinsic Christian authority attaching to the bishop of Rome. If this were not so, it is difficult to see why in the practical order the discipline of Gregory VII did not come into effect centuries earlier. The Roman hierocratic theory was already worked out. The authority intrinsic to the Roman pontiff obviously does not vary (this is implicit in the Roman see's own claim to its authority being de jure divino), but what was lacking earlier was the power needed to implement the theory.⁹⁰

88. K. Morrison, The Two Kingdoms (Princeton, N.J., 1964)

89. William refused to accede to Gregory VII's demand that all archbishops come to Rome to receive the pallium from him personally; William's position was strengthened (as in other matters was Lanfranc's in England) by Gregory's need to follow a conciliatory policy with William the Conqueror.

90. Even Gregory VII was frustrated in his attempts to assert full authority; such success came under later popes, reaching its zenith in Innocent III.

It is also important to notice the pivotal role exercised by monasticism and the mendicants in the struggle between pope and bishops. The most durable form of monasticism in the West was that begun by Benedict of Nursia. In time it absorbed into itself the Celtic foundations on the Continent.⁹¹ Its influence on the episcopacy (and presbyterate) was of considerable importance, for one reason because so many bishops were drawn from monasteries, especially in times of attempted church reform. Benedictine monasticism tended to integrate better with the episcopal pattern; however, its ties were traditionally strong with the bishop of Rome, and in the struggle between the papacy and episcopacy the great Benedictine houses (particularly Cluny) proved to be of valuable support for the papacy.

It is difficult to see how the Roman ascendancy of the eleventh century and thereafter could have occurred without Western monasticism. Not only was some of the most effective papal leadership, like Hildebrand, drawn from monastic life, but the influential monastic institutions were a source of considerable support for the pope.⁹² Already, many of these monastic establishments were more closely linked to the pope than to the local episcopacy by virtue of their exempt status.⁹³ Moreover, prom-

91. On the background of Benedict and the Rule, see D. Knowles, The Monastic in England (Cambridge, 1941), pp. 3-15.

92. See H. Cowdry, The Cluniacs and the Gregorian Reform (Oxford, 1970).

93. Exemption touched upon two basic elements: the property of the monasteries was part of "the patrimony of Peter and Paul" and so was protected from incursion and freed from taxes; and the monks were not subject to the jurisdiction of the local bishop. Exemptions were so widespread in Italy that when Clement VII ordered bishops residing in Rome to return to their dioceses in an attempt to counter Protestant accusations of non-residence and to show that the church intended reform, the bishops refused to return unless they were made masters in their own dioceses by being given jurisdiction over the monasteries and monastic churches.

inent abbots exerted considerable moral leadership in the society of that day, and they along with the monastic houses that ministered in many ways to the people threw their support behind the papal position. Conversely, the papacy of this period, particularly Urban II (himself a former Cluniac monk), generally supported monastic institutions in their disputes with bishops.

Theologically, what the rise of the mendicant friars questioned was the intrinsic relationship between the episcopacy and presbyterate. While it is true that such friar-priests were dependent upon the episcopate for priestly ordination, and while a certain modus vivendi was worked out historically, the religious communities, and especially the new foundations that were encouraged and "approved" by the pope, operated in a manner that transcended diocesan boundaries or control.⁹⁴ The medieval popes fortified this tendency, for it gave them a powerful ally in their desire to establish their primacy vis-a-vis the episcopacy.⁹⁵ This raised a question which has never been satisfactorily answered: Can there be, and should there be, a segment of the sacerdotium which functions apart from episcopal control, though in close fraternal cooperation

94. This became a prominent factor from the Cluniac movement onward. Prior to that time one does not find the large-scale and centralized direction of religious communities which consequently present a challenge to episcopal control, though the monastic evolution of the Irish church (and its offshoots) had earlier threatened to overshadow the episcopal organization of church life.

95. Gregory VII developed considerably the policy of granting exempt status to monastic institutions and this became a cardinal principle of papal ecclesiastical politics in the succeeding centuries. See n. 93, p. 121.

with the episcopacy?⁹⁶ And a further question: If the previous question is answered affirmatively, need such "freer" expressions of priestly life and ministry be tied to ecclesiastically constituted and approved (i.e., Roman-controlled) religious communities? The very notion of the presbyter as essentially "bishop's delegate" is what comes up for questioning. One wonders if this very question was not in the air during the Middle Ages. Perhaps it helps explain the widespread influence of Jerome's ideas on the theological explanation of bishop-presbyter relations that we observed in the last section of this chapter.⁹⁷

The combination of the early respect for the preeminence of Rome as the apostolic see of Peter (and of Paul, which gave the Roman church a "bonus" in tracing its apostolic origins⁹⁸), the carefully-sorted testimony of the fathers, the collection of decretals and the development of the code of canon law, plus the developing theology of primacy that used to best advantage the scriptures, the doctrine of the "two swords," and the distinction between potestas ordinis and potestas jurisdictionis - all these gave the advantage to the pope over the bishops when they met

96. Such fraternal cooperation is, of course, the ideal; historically, there has been almost continuous friction, abetted no little by the friction between papacy and episcopacy. Apart from these pastorally important practical matters, the underlying theological question is that of the relationship of the episcopal collegium to the presbyteral collegium - which is more basic?

97. Jerome's influence, as we have seen, was most noticeable in the theological tendency to view episcopacy and presbyterate as one priestly order. One cannot but wonder whether religious orders with their monastic and mendicant expressions of ordained presbyters were not largely responsible for keeping alive during the Middle Ages this question of episcopal-presbyteral relationship.

98. Liturgical evidence for the importance of the Petrine-Pauline relationship is to be seen in the regulations of the pre-Vatican II rite which decreed that on every feast in honor of Peter a commemorative collect for Paul should be said, and vice versa.

at Trent to shore up the church against the onslaught of the Reformers. Just as Trent refused to dogmatize about the essential nature of the presbyterate, but established a status quo in favor of the bishops, so it refused to pass judgment on the question of the source of episcopal authority, but instituted an ecclesiastical regimen decidedly in favor of papal prerogatives.⁹⁹ Vatican I would see the triumphal expression of the doctrine of papal primacy, an event which appeared to eclipse forever the place of the episcopate in the firmament of the Church, and make it at best a pale moon reflecting the light of the successors of Peter. But Vatican II, as we will see in the next chapter, sought to regain the balance and re-emphasized the collegiality of the bishops and affirmed the proper authority of their office as de jure divino, rejecting what would have been the ultimate papal triumph, a statement that bishops only hold their office from and through the pope.

The significance of the episcopal order was not to remain simply a matter of concern for the Roman church. Nineteenth century England saw a revival of interest in the traditions of Catholic Christianity, and central to that revival was the teaching concerning apostolic succession and the primacy of the episcopacy for faith, order, and unity. It would lead to scholarly research that would be applied to the benefit of the Roman bishops, and it would create ecumenical controversy among Protestants in a way the Roman claims, by virtue of being Roman, had been unable to do. The Oxford Movement provided the last of the major occasions in the search for episcopal identity.

99. Jedin, Crisis and Closure

4. The Oxford Movement and the "Historic Episcopate"

All current Protestant ecumenical discussions regarding the "historic episcopate"¹⁰⁰ and the apostolic succession find their origin in the Tractarian insistence upon the primacy of the episcopate for faith and order. The growth and success of the Oxford reformers first forced the Anglican episcopacy to re-examine itself and then, as the ecumenical age dawned, the bishops with their newly-recognized identity had to insist upon it in their negotiations with other communions.

Keble's sermon on "National Apostasy," the inaugural sermon of the Oxford Movement, was written in protest against the suppression of certain Irish sees, an act initiated and executed by the British Parliament with no concurring voice from the bishops or any other ecclesiastical authority. Keble and his companions feared that the Church was on the way to becoming purely an instrument of the State, and after the Reform Bill it was a State which no longer guaranteed that those with authority to dispose of Church property would even be members of that Church. The question facing the Tractarians was, If it is no longer tenable to maintain that the Church has an independent existence under the monarch, where is the basis for her independence to be found? Their answer was in the episcopate, descended from the apostles, authorized by Jesus himself, the sign of unity and orthodoxy. It was to promote this view of an episcopally ordered Church (among other things) that the

100. Such discussions would date from the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral of 1886, 1888 when the Anglican churches sought to provide incentive for church unity and saw themselves in the role of the "bridge-church" and an enabler of unity.

Tracts for the Times were written.¹⁰¹

The first of the Tracts was by Newman, addressed ad Clerum, and was entitled "Thoughts on the Ministerial Commission." It set the tone for what was to follow and enunciated in clear terms what he considered to be the basis of authority for the faith and practice of the Church of England.

CHRIST has not left His Church without claim of its own upon the attention of men. Surely not. Hard Master He cannot be, to bid us oppose the world, yet give us no credentials for so doing. There are some who rest their divine mission on their own unsupported assertion; others, who rest it upon their popularity; others, on their success; and others, who rest it upon their temporal distinctions. This last case has, perhaps, been too much our own; I fear we have neglected the real ground on which our authority is built, -OUR APOSTOLICAL DESCENT.

We have been born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of GOD. The Lord JESUS CHRIST gave His Spirit to His Apostles; they in turn laid their hands on those who should succeed them; and these again on others; and so the sacred gift has been handed down to our present Bishops, who have appointed us as their assistants, and in some sense representatives.¹⁰²

Fourteen of the forty-six tracts in the first volume relate to apos-

101. "The following Tracts were published with the object of contributing something towards the practical revival of doctrines, which, although held by the great divines of our Church, at present have become obsolete with the majority of her members, and are withdrawn from public view even by the more learned and orthodox few who still adhere to them. The Apostolic succession, the Holy Catholic Church, were principles of action in the minds of our predecessors of the 17th century; but, in proportion as the maintenance of the Church has been secured by law, her ministers have been under the temptation of leaning on an arm of flesh instead of her own divinely-provided discipline, a temptation increased by political events and arrangements which need not here be more than alluded to." - "Advertisement" in Tracts for the Times, Vol. I (London, 1834), p. iii

102. Ibid., p. 2

tolic succession, either trying to establish it as a doctrine to be received by the Church or endeavoring to prove that, once established, it exists in the Church of England. Published with the Tracts was a series under the title "Records of the Church." These consisted of translations of the early fathers and accounts of martyrdoms. All the epistles of Ignatius were included in the first volume to provide historical evidence for the claims being made for episcopacy by the Tractarians.

Such a high claim for the office of bishop was nothing new in Anglicanism;¹⁰³ what was disconcerting in a church that had become increasingly latitudinarian was the insistence upon the necessity of the episcopate for the assurance of salvation. Salvation was not denied to those outside episcopal communion, but the validity of their worship was called into question. Keble spelled out the logic of his position in the fourth Tract.

Their [the early fathers'] principle, in short, was this: That the Holy Feast of our Saviour's sacrifice, which all confess to be "generally necessary to salvation," was intended by him to be constantly conveyed through the hands of commissioned persons. Except therefore we can show such a warrant, we cannot be sure that our hands convey the sacrifice; we cannot be sure that souls worthily prepared, receiving the bread which we break, and the cup of blessing which we bless, are partakers of the Body and Blood of Christ. Piety, then, and Christian Reverence, and sincere, devout love of our Redeemer, nay, and Charity to the souls of our brethren, not good order and expediency only, would prompt us, at all earthly risks, to preserve and transmit the seal and warrant of Christ...¹⁰⁴

103. Perhaps the best collection in one volume of the history of thought about the meaning of episcopacy in Anglicanism is A.J. Mason's The Church of England and Episcopacy (Cambridge, 1914). It contains extensive quotations with little critical comment, but the author is sympathetic to the Anglo-Catholic cause.

104. Tracts, I, iv, p. 2

Why then should any man here in Britain, fear or hesitate boldly to assert the authority of the Bishops and Pastors of the Church, on grounds strictly evangelical and spiritual: as bringing men nearest to Christ our Saviour, and conforming them most exactly to His mind, indicated both by His own conduct, and by the words of His Spirit in the Apostolic writings? Why should we talk so much of an establishment, and so little of an APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION? Why should we not seriously endeavour to impress our people with this plain truth; -that by separating themselves from our communion, they separate themselves not only from a decent, orderly, useful society, but from THE ONLY CHURCH IN THIS REALM WHICH HAS A RIGHT TO BE QUITE SURE THAT SHE HAS THE LORD'S BODY TO GIVE TO HIS PEOPLE?¹⁰⁵

... "Necessary to Salvation," and "necessary to Church Communion," are not to be used as convertible terms. Neither do we desire to pass sentence on other persons of other countries; but we are not to shrink from our deliberate views of truth and duty, because difficulties may be raised about the case of such persons; any more than we should fear to maintain the paramount necessity of Christian belief, because similar difficulties may be raised about virtuous Heathens, Jews, or Mahometans. To us such questions are abstract, not practical: and whether we can answer them or no, it is our business to keep fast hold of the Church Apostolical, whereof we are actual members; not merely on civil or ecclesiastical grounds, but from real personal love and reverence, affectionate reverence to our Lord and only Saviour. And let men seriously bear in mind, that it is one thing to slight and disparage this holy Succession where it may be had, and another thing to acquiesce in the want of it, where it is (if it be any where,) really unattainable.¹⁰⁶

Thus it was that the bishops and their office became crucial for the Anglo-Catholics, and by so doing induced an "identity crisis" among the episcopate. Evangelical and latitudinarian bishops were not eager to have such an honor bestowed upon them as the Tractarians were insistent upon doing. Bishops who had thought of themselves in the "catholic" or "Laudian" tradition rejoiced in this sudden expression of support from the ranks of clergy and laity. Both groups began to marshall evidence

105. Ibid., p. 5

106. Ibid., p. 6

for their respective views.

The Tractarians suffered from one major handicap at the outset, and that was that the term "apostolic succession" or any of its equivalents were absent from all the official Anglican formularies.¹⁰⁷ Individual bishops or theologians might have employed the term in discussions of church order, but none of those were binding upon the faithful.¹⁰⁸ The opening sentence of the preface to the Ordinal was sufficiently ambigu-

107. See the article by Stephen Neill in Office and Ministry in the Church (London, 1972), R. Murphy and B. van Iserl, ed.

108. A representative sample from Mason might include the following:

"...we succeed the bishops that have been before our days. We are elected, consecrate, confirmed, and admitted, as they were." -Bishop Jewel.

"We make no doubt but that the episcopal degree which we bear is an institution apostolical and divine, and so always hath been held by a continued course of times from the apostles to this very age of ours..." -Archbishop Whitgift.

"We ... determine with Augustine ... to rest in the bosom of that church, which from the seat of the apostles by consent of mankind hath continued by succession of bishops..." -Wm. Fulke.

"The priesthood which the apostles conferred was only a spiritual power to minister the word and sacraments, which being conveyed to posterity successively by ordination is indeed found at this day in some sort in the church of Rome, ...in regard whereof you may be said to succeed the apostles, and Cranmer you, and we Cranmer; and consequently we also in this succeed the apostles as well as you." -F. Mason.

"Hisce episcopis apostolorum autoritate sic stabilita^{et} constat perpetua serie successores fuisse subrogatos in iisdem civitatibus..." -Bishop Davenant.

"And therefore, that the apostolate might be perpetual and successive, Christ gave them a power of ordination.... Of necessity a succession must be constituted in the ordinary office of apostolate." -Jeremy Taylor.

"...wise men know it is a great honour to the church of England, and a great stopple in the mouths of the Romanists, that her bishops can derive their calling successively from St. Peter..." -Archbishop Laud.

"...I am well satisfied ... that my ordination is authentic, ... being by men ordained in an uninterrupted succession by the primitive bishops, as they were by the Apostles, and the Apostles by Christ, and Jesus Christ by God Himself..." -Bishop Ken.

ous to be exegeted in favor of either side.¹⁰⁹ The Thirty-Nine Articles, the one standard of doctrine to which all the clergy had to subscribe, could more easily be used by the Protestant arm of the Church, and it was in the attempt to defend the Articles from a Catholic perspective that Newman encountered the combined opposition of the University of Oxford and the bishops.¹¹⁰ The result was that the Tractarians were forced into the awkward position of having to defend the unique status of the bishops as they saw it from the intransigence of the episcopal college itself.

Anglo-Catholic apologetic invoked the works of the fathers, especially Cyprian, as justification for the episcopal model of government, and the earlier Anglican divines who had maintained a "high" view of episcopacy; and they laid great stress upon the maintenance of episcopal succession in the English church. For the remainder of the nineteenth century and well into the twentieth much New Testament and patristic research was motivated by the desire of the Anglo-Catholics to make good their claims to an apostolic pedigree. But just when their point seemed to be made, and when the third generation was rejoicing in the fruits of the newly-discovered English Catholic heritage, Leo XIII made his announcement that from the Roman point of view Anglican orders

109. It is interesting to compare the scholarly presuppositions and to see the growing influence of modern Biblical criticism in the course of the debate. John Henry Blunt's comments on the preface to the Ordinal written in 1866 (The Annotated Book of Common Prayer, vol. 2, pp. 540-43) show no exposure to the principles of criticism and philology that had produced John William Donaldson's A Vindication of Protestant Principles as early as 1847.

110. Tract XC ... with a Historical Preface (Oxford, 1865)

were "absolutely null and utterly void."¹¹¹ The promulgation of the bull Apostolicae Curae in 1896 was at once devastating and unifying. It provided the Protestants who had resented the Anglican claims to "comprehensiveness" the opportunity to ridicule those claims in so far as they implied a "superior" form of ordination, and it disconcerted the members of the Catholic wing of the church who had envisioned a coming reunion with Rome. The bull not only destroyed such hopes; it also left the Anglo-Catholics with no support from that very branch of Christendom where they had come to look indirectly at least for guidance. The message from Rome in effect was that they had all been "playing church" since 1833.

But how successful the Oxford Movement had been in convincing the rest of Anglicanism of the truth of its claims is to be seen by the response of the English archbishops to Leo's declaration.¹¹² They felt obliged to defend Anglican orders not on a typically Protestant basis, but on one which would involve continuation of the historic episcopate. Leo was answered on his own terms, something it is difficult imagining Archbishop Herring doing a hundred and fifty years earlier.^{112a} So from

¹¹¹. The text of the bull with translation may be found in A. Barnes, The Popes and the Ordinal (London, 1898), pp. 43-73.

¹¹². Responsio (London, 1897)

^{112a}. E.g., Herring on the removal of Anselm's bones from Canterbury to his birthplace at Aosta: "He had no great scruples on this head - he wrote - but if he had, he would get rid of them all, if the parting of the rotten remains of a rebel to his king, a slave to the popedom, and an enemy to the married clergy (all this Anselm was) would purchase ease and indulgence to one living Protestant." E. Carpenter, Cantuar (London, 1971), p. 262

1896 the Anglo-Catholics had to wage war on two fronts: against the Protestants who had never agreed with their view of the origins and authority of the episcopacy, and against the Roman Catholics who maintained that while their theology, at least since 1833, was going in the right direction, they had left the main road in the sixteenth century.

Following the Roman condemnation one is struck by the fetish-like concern for "validity" which is found in Anglo-Catholic literature.¹¹³ By committing themselves to a tactile theory of succession they had made it the cornerstone of their theology, and one almost senses the panic they felt at the prospect of a missing pair of hands. The obviously magical connotations were derided by Protestant writers and were taken advantage of by a growing number of episcopi vagantes, wandering bishops with presumably "valid" orders who could ordain priests and create ecclesial bodies at will.¹¹⁴ Faith in the apostolic succession of the Anglican episcopate became primary for many. So Charles Gore concluded his massive work on The Church and the Ministry: "It follows then - not that God's grace has not worked, and worked largely, through many an irregular ministry where it was exercised or used in good faith, but - that a ministry not episcopally received is invalid, that is to say, falls outside the conditions of covenanted security and cannot justify its existence in terms of the covenant."¹¹⁵

Proposals for the creation of the Church of South India brought the

113. See, e.g., "Episcopacy and Reunion," Church Quarterly Review 54 (1902), pp. 178-203.

114. P. Anson, Bishops at Large (London, 1964); H. Brandreth, Episcopi Vagantes and the Anglican Church (London, 1947)

115. (London, 1936), p. 305

controversy to its peak of polemic and produced as well the last major scholarly effort by Anglo-Catholic theologians to justify their position.¹¹⁶ That work was The Apostolic Ministry, published in 1946 under the direction of the bishop of Oxford, Kenneth E. Kirk. The list of contributors included many of the eminent Anglo-Catholic scholars of the day,¹¹⁷ all recruited against what was considered to be a non-doctrinal and pragmatic understanding of the episcopacy. It was immediately answered by such Protestants as T.W. Manson in The Church's Ministry (1948), but the most telling reply was published in 1954 and it provided the Anglican compromise that has served to make the Church of South India a reality. The book was The Historic Episcopate in the Fullness of the Church, edited by Kenneth M. Carey with contributions by other future Anglican bishops such as Hugh Montefiore and John A.T. Robinson. As the title indicates, their position was that the episcopate is not the esse of the Church, but rather that the Church only finds completeness in an episcopal system which is the result of the development of her ecclesial life under the Spirit. This compromise seemed to suit the needs of the majority of Anglicans, and although the extreme position represented by Kirk's book is still maintained by not a few, it is clearly to be identified with a "wing" of the church.

It is ironic that the great burst of scholarship unleashed by the Oxford Movement and the descendants of the Tractarians in an attempt to

116. E.g., K. Mackenzie, The Case for Episcopacy (London, 1929) and A. G. Hebert, The Form of the Church (London, 1944). The controversy is described in B. Sundkler, Church of South India: The Movement Towards Union 1900-1947 (London, 1954).

117. There were included, beside Bishop Kirk, A.M. Farrer, Gregory Dix, Bishop Mackenzie, and A.G. Hebert.

prove their contentions about episcopacy has resulted in an ecumenical scholarly consensus that has created a new identity crisis for the episcopacy at the end of the twentieth century.¹¹⁸ And not only for the Anglican bishops, but for those of Rome as well as the influence of New Testament, patristic, and historical research has been felt there.¹¹⁹ "Validity" is coming to be seen as what the Spirit imparts and is evidenced by fruits of the Spirit and not by genealogy. "Succession" is succession in the teaching and fellowship of the apostles, an attribute of the whole Church.¹²⁰ Newman said that the Anglicans believe they are in the true Church because they have valid orders, while the Romans believe they have valid orders because they are in the true Church.¹²¹ The greatest bequest of the Oxford Movement to this generation may be the call to a re-examination of what creates a Catholic community and what in turn a Catholic community creates. The supporting and sustaining role of the bishop in that community must provide one of the areas for exploration. In the next chapter we shall examine three efforts at such exploration by the contemporary Church.

118. This is reflected particularly in the preparatory articles for the 1978 Lambeth Conference which we will examine in the next chapter.

119. Such authors as Botte, Brown, Congar, Dupuy, Küng, and Rahner come immediately to mind.

120. For a recent discussion of validity and apostolic succession indicating the reconsideration now being given those terms, see Apostolic Succession, H. Küng, ed., vol. 34 of Concilium (New York, 1968).

121. Essays Critical and Historical, vol. 2 (London, 1871), p. 87

CHAPTER THREE: THREE RECENT STATEMENTS RELATING TO THE
MINISTRY AND FUNCTION OF BISHOPS

Before proceeding to an examination of recent consecration rites, we will first look closely at three recent statements, each from a different source, to see how they have dealt with the meaning of episcopal ministry. First (and earliest) of the statements is Chapter III of Lumen Gentium, the dogmatic constitution on the Church issued by the Second Vatican Council in 1964. As part of a dogmatic constitution it represents the authoritative teaching of the Roman church about episcopacy, and it provided the doctrinal guidelines for the revisers of the Roman Pontifical. We will also examine the decree issued a year later concerning the pastoral office of bishops in the Church, an attempt by the Council to relate the previous constitution in a practical way to episcopal ministry in the latter part of the twentieth century. This decree also preceded the new edition of the Pontifical.

Next, we will review "The Ordained Ministry in Ecumenical Perspective: An agreed Statement of the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches," published in 1974. While it does not deal with episcopal ministry exclusively (or even in depth), it has profound implications for what that ministry may mean and be in a Christian fellowship that seeks to be catholic, evangelical, and reformed. And its statements on apostolic succession and the meaning of ordination were formulated in large part not only because of the on-going influence of the Tractarians that we noticed at the end of the last chapter, but in response to the doctrinal affirmations of Lumen Gentium as well.

Finally, we will examine the preparatory articles for and the reports issuing from the 1978 Lambeth Conference. Although these documents do not have official or authoritative doctrinal status in any part of the Anglican communion, they do reflect the considered opinions of major Anglican theologians and are representative of the way in which the Anglican episcopate is attempting to examine and order its life and ministry to meet the demands of the present age.

1a. Lumen Gentium¹

From the time that Pope John announced his intention to convene a council it was understood that consideration of the nature and function of the episcopacy would be a primary item for the agenda. This was to resume the task of Vatican I which had intended to define the place of the episcopacy in the Church after its definition of papal primacy and infallibility, but the abrupt adjournment prevented any attention being paid to the bishop's place in the structures of the Church. The fathers of Vatican II expressed clearly that it was their intention to continue the work of Vatican I in clarifying and defining the hierarchical structures of the Church (in eodem incepto pergens) on the basis of the papal doctrines promulgated in 1870 (rursus proponit). Yet while affirming their adherence to the earlier dogma and stating their intention to con-

1. The text of Lumen Gentium and Christus Dominus is that published by the Vatican Polyglot Press (1966). English translations are from The Documents of Vatican II, Abbott and Gallagher, ed., (New York, 1966). Two commentaries on the documents to which the reader is referred for fuller background are Vatican II: An Interfaith Appraisal, J.H. Miller, ed. (New York, 1966) and Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II, 4 vol., H. Vorgrimler, ed. (London, 1969).

tinue in the path of the former council (vestigia premens), they at the same time began by defining bishops in terms of their collegial relation to the pope and their unique relationship to the apostles (de Episcopis, successoribus Apostolorum, qui cum successore Petri ... domum Dei viventis regunt...). Beginning with that understanding of who the bishop is, the fathers in seven articles attempted to deal with the questions inherited from history.

Article 18 begins by placing all ministry within the framework of service to the People of God, for their "nurturing and constant growth." We are told that Christ instituted a variety of ministries (varia ministeria) for the good of the whole body, and that those ministers "who are endowed with sacred power" (qui sacra potestate pollent) "are servants of their brethren." The "sacred power" is never defined as to its extent in the Church; the reader is left to infer what it means from what is later said about the office of each order. The two elements so long recognized in the history of theology as comprising the sacred power, the power of order and the power of jurisdiction, are not given any further clarification either here or later on.

Article 19 is concerned with the New Testament background of the episcopate in so far as bishops are the successors of the apostles. It describes the formation of the apostolic college by Jesus under the headship of Peter and their mission to Israel and the world. Two things are particularly worth noticing in this article. The first is that the formation of the apostolic body is described as being "in the manner of" a college or fixed group (ad modum collegii seu coetus stabilis). The in-

tention here appears to be to undercut any analogy with those collegial systems which elect their own head from among their number. The similarity may be taken only so far because of the special relationship Peter and his successors have to the college. Also of interest is the manner in which the council avoided having to deal with the potential conflicts of interpretation between Ephesians 2:20 where all the apostles are considered as the foundation of the Church, and Matthew 16:18 where Peter alone is considered as the foundation. The council declared that the Lord founded the Church on the apostles and built it on Peter (in Apostolis condidit et supra beatum Petrum, eorum principem, aedificavit). There is no effort made to relate the dogmatic affirmations to historical evidence in this article. Scripture citations are used more as a witness to the faith of the Church in those things being proclaimed by the council rather than for any intrinsic historical merit they might have. That the historic Jesus called disciples is the only declaration of the council that would generally satisfy the demands of historical or textual evidence.

Article 20 deals with the historic continuation of apostolicity in the Church through the episcopate. Such a continuation is part of the eschatological nature of the Church because her function is to proclaim the gospel to the end of the age (Quapropter Apostoli ... de instituendis successoribus curam egerunt). The degree to which this is supposed to be a proof of transmission is not clear. It does raise the interesting conjecture that proof of transmission would cease to be necessary (i.e., succession lists) in a church which truly believed that the epis-

copacy was the divine means of continuing the mission of Christ because it already has the guarantee of Christ in the passage cited by the article (Matt. 28:20).

The major function of Article 20 is to describe the process by which the original apostles arranged for their ministry to be continued after their death. We are told that the apostles appointed helpers during their lifetime, committed their work to the helpers, and arranged that they in turn should be succeeded by approved men. I Clement is quoted as proof of the care taken for the proper transmission of ministry. The article recognizes the various ministries exercised in the Church from earliest times, but then goes on to maintain that it was through the medium of episcopacy that the apostles chose to continue their unique ministry. The council's authority for its statement is the witness of tradition (teste traditione).

Finally, the article declares that just as the office persists, so too it is to be permanently exercised (Sicut autem permanet munus ... ita ... iugiter exercendum). Karl Rahner comments on the importance of this statement:

It not merely affirms, in effect, that the biblical office of Peter persists legitimately in the Roman primacy, and that of the apostles (the Twelve) in the episcopate. It also presupposes, without any reserves, that in both cases (sicut ... ita) the biblical origin and justification are the same. Hence the exegetical stringency of the biblical proof, and the intrinsic equivalence of the offices, as affirmed by tradition for St. Peter and the Pope, cannot be reasonably denied in the second case, that of the twelve apostles and the bishops. Otherwise the matter of the primacy would be called in question, all the more so since St. Peter had prerogatives which cannot be transmitted to

the Pope.²

The article concludes with a summary sentence in which the council announced that its teaching (docet) is that by divine institution the bishops have succeeded to the place of the apostles (ex divina institutione in locum Apostolorum successisse). This means no less than that an episcopal constitution is seen as being of the very nature of the Church. Being of divine institution (and one supposes that ex jure divino could have been as appropriately employed), there was never a case of the form of episkope being left to the decision of the People of God. The scripture texts previously cited give no clue as to how this divine institution came about. This concluding sentence will prepare the way for the assertion made in Article 28 that the divinely instituted office bestowed on the apostles by Christ was transmitted by them to different persons in varying degrees and thus will make clear that the presbyterate only shares partially in the sacrament of order. Article 21 will elaborate more fully the significance of the fullness of order in the episcopate.

Article 21 continues an emphasis made at the end of the previous article where it was said that as the bishops are pastors of the Church whoever hears them hears Christ and whoever rejects them rejects Christ. It declares that Christ the Supreme High Priest exercises his ministry through their excellent service (per eorum eximium servitium) by the preaching of the Word, the administration of the sacraments, and the direction and guidance which is a result of their wisdom and prudence.

2. Vorgrimler, vol. 1, p. 191

Christ is recognized as the source of all priestly graces and gifts, and the bishops are the vehicles through which he operates. Presbyters are assistants to the bishops and share in the priesthood by delegation from above. Episcopal consecration confers the fullness of the sacrament of orders (plenitudinem ... sacramenti Ordinis), which is a participation in the gift of the Holy Spirit poured upon the apostles at Pentecost and conveyed by them through the imposition of hands. The powers conveyed in consecration are related to the priestly, prophetic, and kingly roles of Christ himself - the powers of sanctifying, teaching, and governing. This teaching has profound significance for the traditional distinction between potestas ordinis and potestas jurisdictionis. The former has been held to be the result of sacramental ordination and the latter has been seen to be conveyed by the pope or some other authority. As now defined, a bishop by virtue of his consecration holds the two powers as a result of that "sacred character so impressed" (sacrum characterem ita imprimi). A bishop still requires canonical authority to exercise the powers legally, but the authority is given by the college of bishops of which he is a member by virtue of his consecration. This means that there can be no "second class" bishops comprised of auxiliaries and assistants, with full rights reserved to the diocesan bishops. Jurisdiction is conveyed by the college, and it need not be restricted to governing a diocese since the work of the whole church requires governance in areas other than diocesan leadership. The much discussed Nota Explicativa was added to the constitution by a "higher authority" before the pro-

mulgation of the document in order to ensure that the importance of hierarchical authority in determining jurisdiction not be slighted. In spite of the resentment it generated among many of the fathers because of the manner of its presentation, it does not in any way compromise the theological and practical implications of what the council decreed in the constitution itself.

Article 22 deals with the college of bishops. The previous articles drew the parallels between the college of the apostles and that of the episcopate as a continuation of the apostolic collegium, and this article goes on to define the episcopal college in more precise ways. First, there is a college of bishops that is more than simply the sum of the individual bishops and their powers. This means, in Karl Rahner's words, that "the power of the individual bishop as an individual - the threefold office - is to be regarded as coming to him insofar as he is a member of the college and sharer in the power of the college as such."³ Secondly, this college continues the college of the apostles and therefore exists by divine right and institution. It is not like the original apostolic college in every way, of course, ~~since~~ since the role of the apostles as eye-witnesses who were the first to believe remains unique, but, "in the episcopal order the apostolic body continues without a break" (in quo corpus apostolicum continuo perseverat). Since we were told in Article 19 that Jesus himself established the Twelve as a "permanent group" and that he wills the Church to continue to the end of time (Article 20), it follows that the "sacred or-

3. Ibid., p. 198

der" of bishops as a group is of divine institution. Third, continuing the parallel between the original Twelve and Peter, it also follows that the episcopal college "exists only insofar as it takes in the Pope as its head and hence as an intrinsic element constitutive of its being."⁴ The variety among the members of the college is indicative of the "variety and universality of the People of God," but in its relation to the pope is expressive of the unity of the Church. Fourth, the college, i.e., bishops and pope, possesses full and supreme authority over the Church. Such exercise of authority must be fully collegial, i.e., it must represent agreement between bishops and pope, with the qualification that the pope may act on his own in the name of the college. But the authority of the bishops does not derive from the pope. What difference this may in fact make in practice is difficult to determine. The council reaffirmed the primacy in the terms of Vatican I, which means that the pope has the same authority over the Church (and over individual bishops) as the college of bishops as a whole. One must ask, in any ecumenical discussions, whether or not we are dealing with a legal fiction designed to preserve the dignity of the episcopate without altering in any way the possibility for arbitrary action by the pope.

Article 23 deals with the relation of the bishop to his own church and his responsibilities for the entire Church. We are reminded first of all that the Roman pontiff is the primary source and sign of unity of all the bishops and the faithful, but that the individual bishop "is the visible principle and foundation of unity in his particular church"

(visibile principium et fundamentum sunt unitatis in suis Ecclesiis par-

4. Ibid., p. 199

ticularibus). A bishop is restricted to the governance of his own diocese and he is not to exercise authority in any other or over the universal Church, but because of his membership in the college he is "to be solicitous for the whole Church" (solicitudine pro universa Ecclesia). This point was taken up and applied in the later decree of the council on the Church's Missionary Activity (Ad Gentes), Article 6, and in Christus Dominus, the decree on the Bishops' Pastoral Office, Article 6.

Article 24 is a transition from the earlier general discussion of the bishop in relation to the whole Church to a discussion of his exercise of his roles as prophet, priest, and governor in his diocese. It re-emphasizes the authority given to the episcopate by the mandate of Christ and the empowering action of the Holy Spirit in equipping them for the work of diakonia. Once again we are reminded that the bishop is able to function only if in communion with the successor of Peter.

Article 25 begins by stressing the importance of the preaching function in the ministry of the episcopate. Bishops are "preachers of the faith" (fidei praecones) and "authentic teachers ... endowed with the authority of Christ" (doctores authentici ... auctoritate Christi praediti). They preach to the people "the faith they must believe (credendam) and put into practice (applicandam)." It is interesting to a Protestant observer to note the ease with which preaching merges into teaching. Preaching is recognized as an evangelical task since its function is to "lead new disciples to Christ." But once that has been acknowledged, the focus is entirely upon the magisterial office as it is shared by bishops and

pope. A Protestant would be inclined to say that this is indicative of a lack of understanding of the true nature of preaching or the prophetic proclamation of the word. The good news is somehow lost among the lessons to be learned.^{4a} In fact, most of Article 25 is devoted to a lengthy exposition of papal infallibility and an attempt to show how that infallibility is shared by the bishops in college because the pope is their head. It is also clearly stated that the teaching authority of the bishops as well as the pope demands from the faithful "a religious submission of will and mind" (religiosum voluntatis et intellectus obsequium). The bishops cannot teach that which is contrary to the pope because of the very nature of the college which operates "in accord with revelation itself" (secundum ipsam Revelationem). This article appears clearly to be the weakest in the chapter because it neglects any real consideration of the function of preaching, it assumes that the teaching authority is the same as the preaching function, and it appears to have served primarily as a vehicle for elaborating once again the anti-Gallican sentiments of Vatican I. The Roman pontiff is certainly the subject of this article, not the bishops.

Article 26, after the previous excursus on papal infallibility, returns to the subject of the offices of the bishop and has as its theme the priestly office and function of sanctification. Again we are reminded that the bishop has "the fullness of the sacrament of orders," and, in a quotation from the Byzantine rite for episcopal consecration,

^{4a}. We will return to this subject in our consideration of Article 12 of Christus Dominus. See n. 7 below.

that he is "the steward of the grace of the supreme priesthood" (oeconomus gratiae supremi sacerdotii). The Eucharist, which creates the Body of Christ in every local congregation, is regulated by him. There is, in fact, no "legitimate" celebration without his authorization and approval, which is to say that the bishop is to be considered present with his people wherever mass is offered. The bishop is called to pray and labor for the people, particularly in the following ways: (1) by the ministry of the word; (2) through overseeing the regular distribution of the sacraments; (3) by governing the conferring of baptism; (4) by being the "original ministers of confirmation, dispensers of sacred orders, and the moderators of penitential discipline"; (5) by providing instruction in the proper participation in the liturgy; and (6) by the example of their manner of life (exemplo conversationis). No mention is made here of the relation of the bishop to his presbyters in the exercise of priestly functions. That is reserved for Article 28 which deals with the presbyterate as the "prudent co-operators with the episcopal order," but the question as to where the source of priesthood lies is firmly answered in Article 26. It provides the basis for the later article. The final emphasis on the bishop as moral exemplar is taken up in Chapter 5 of the Constitution, "The Call of the Whole Church to Holiness." ⁵

Those chosen for the fullness of the priesthood are gifted with sacramental grace enabling them to exercise a perfect role of pastoral charity through prayer, sacrifice, and preaching, as through every form of a bishop's care and service.

Article 27, the final article in the section on the episcopacy, deals with the third of the bishop's roles in the Church, that of governing. They govern as vicars and ambassadors of Christ, and not as representatives of the pope. Their power is "proper, ordinary, and immediate," but it is still necessary to add that its "exercise is ultimately regulated by the supreme authority of the Church, and can be circumscribed by certain limits." The power of the pope to grant or curtail faculties is in no way diminished. It would appear from what is said earlier about the collegial nature of the episcopate and its divine institution, although it is not stated anywhere in the constitution, that the ability of the pope to inhibit an individual bishop is unlimited if, in the pope's mind, such an inhibition is for the good of the entire Church. The pope's ability to inhibit the entire episcopacy only stops at that point where to all effect and purpose the episcopate would cease to exist, since that would be in opposition to the divine will. The pope cannot be the head of a college that does not exist, and since Vatican II the papacy is partially defined by its headship of the episcopal college. By such reasoning the papacy would destroy itself by abolishing a working episcopacy. The Article could not envisage such a possibility, but rather states that the supreme authority of the pope affirms, strengthens, and vindicates the rule of the bishop in his diocese "since the Holy Spirit unfailingly preserves the form of government established by Christ the Lord in His Church." The Article concludes with a reminder of the servant nature of the office, based on the example of Christ, and with an exhortation that the faithful "must cling to their

bishop, as the Church does to Christ," thus combining themes that have appeared throughout the chapter: the bishop as servant of the People of God in obedience to Christ, and the necessity of the willing obedience of the people to the bishop.

1b. Christus Dominus

To understand the mind of the Roman Catholic Church about the ministry of bishops in the latter part of the twentieth century, it is not sufficient merely to study the theological exposition contained in Chapter Three of Lumen Gentium. For if that document is a systematic theological statement about the relation of the bishops to the Church's work of salvation, Christus Dominus, the Decree on the Bishops' Pastoral Office in the Church, is an exercise in practical theology which illustrates how the fathers of the council intended the salvific mission of bishops to be incarnated in the ongoing administrative and pastoral routine of the institution.

The Decree builds upon the work completed a year earlier in Lumen Gentium. The Preface and Article 4 repeat in essence what had already been said about the source of the bishops' office and authority and their relation to the Roman pontiff. The collegial nature of the episcopacy is underlined once again. The first chapter then deals with the relationship of the bishops to the universal Church. Article 5 establishes the Synod of Bishops "to render especially helpful assistance to the supreme pastor of the Church" and points out that "since it will be acting in the name of the entire Catholic episcopate, it will at the same time

demonstrate that all the bishops in hierarchical communion share in the responsibility for the universal Church" (simul significat omnes Episcopos in hierarchica communione sollicitudinis universae Ecclesiae participes esse). Article 6 then enumerates some of the ways in which bishops are expected to manifest their care for all the churches. The responsibility applies chiefly to diocesans since they will be in a position to execute demonstrable concern. They are to (1) foster the preaching of God's word in the missions and in areas where the faithful cannot be adequately cared for because of the lack of priests; (2) have their people support evangelization and other forms of the apostolate, especially helping to prepare priests, religious, and laymen for service in the missions and other apostolic work in areas suffering from a lack of clergy; they are expected to see that some of their priests go to such areas or to the missions, whether permanently or for a certain period of time; and (3) offer financial aid to other dioceses that are in need.

The second section of the first chapter deals with the relations of the bishop to the apostolic see. Article 8 very carefully points out that as successors to the apostles, bishops automatically (per se) have all the authority required for the exercise of their pastoral office, but is equally careful to state that such authority never infringes upon the power of the pope or his right of reservation. That recognition having been made, Article 9 then strikes at the heart of what had been seen by many of the council fathers as the source of unnecessary papal interference, the curia. "The Fathers ... strongly desire (exoptant)

that these departments ... be reorganized and better adapted to the needs of the times..." Also coming under attack, insofar as the diplomatic language of the council would permit, was the use that had been made of papal legates, and the rationale has to do with the inherent right of a bishop as successor to the apostles to bear rule in his own diocese. "The Fathers also strongly desire that, in view of the pastoral role proper to bishops (ratione habita muneris pastoralis Episcoporum proprii), the office of legates of the Roman pontiff be more precisely determined (pressius determinetur)."

And finally, in Article 10, the fathers insisted upon an internationalization of the curia in order to reflect the "truly universal character" (indolem vere universalem) of the Church, and a more open attitude to the advice and experience of the laity so that as a part of the People of God they may have their "appropriate share" (partes sibi congruentes habeant) in the life of the Church, although significantly that share is not defined.

The second chapter of Christus Dominus has to do with the bishops in relation to their particular churches or dioceses. The first chapter guarded their right to bear rule unmolested, as it were, from undue papal interference or from the suggestion that they only function as representatives of the papal authority. This chapter then examines in some detail the weight of responsibility that is upon the bishop for the ordering of his diocese.

The chapter begins by defining a diocese as "that portion of God's people which is entrusted to a bishop to be shepherded by him with the cooperation of the presbytery," and goes on to say that "this portion

constitutes a particular church in which the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church of Christ is truly present and operative" (...Ecclesiam particularem constituat, in qua vere inest et operatur Una Sancta Catholica et Apostolica Christi Ecclesia). This at least suggests that it takes something more than the presence of the bishop to have the fullness of the Church. A "particular church" is constituted by the bishop in company with his presbyters and the faithful. The entire hierarchical structure must be represented. It also has implications for the meaning of the local congregation and for what should be an acceptable size for a diocese. If a "particular church" is to represent in miniature all the qualities of the universal Church, a local congregation will not fit the definition because of its inability to be self-sufficient at the point of training and supplying its clergy and its financial inability to carry on the works of mercy that are entrusted to all the People of God. In the same way, a diocese that is so small that it cannot support its own seminary, maintain schools and hospitals, and have sufficient diversity to need the unifying presence of the bishop might also not strictly qualify. These latter implications are spelled out in Articles 22 to 24 on Diocesan Boundaries. Article 22 enumerates three criteria by which to judge if a diocese is able to fulfill its purpose. First, "the nature of the Church must be clearly evident" (pertinente perspicue manifestetur) to the People of God who belong in that diocese. Secondly, "bishops must be able to carry out their pastoral duties effectively among their people." Third, "the welfare of the People of God must be served as perfectly as possible" (quam per-

fectissime fieri potest). The first qualification guards against dioceses that are or have become too small;⁶ the second and third guard against those that are so large they become impersonal administrative units. Article 23 then proceeds to describe the principles involved in revising diocesan boundaries. "The very first concern must be with the organic unity of each diocese, whose personnel, offices, and institutions must operate like a properly functioning body." It is clear that the mechanistic model has given way to a systemic interpretation of the organization with a strong emphasis on the human relations aspects.^{6a} Special consideration is to be given to population clusters and to the psychological, economic, geographic, and historical characteristics of regions and peoples. The dioceses should be small enough so that the bishop, with assistants, (1) "can exercise his pontifical functions and suitably carry out pastoral visitations, (2) can properly direct and coordinate all the works of the apostolate in his diocese," and (3) "be especially well acquainted with his priests and with the religious and laity who have some part in diocesan enterprises." It should, however, be large enough for all the energies of the bishop and his clergy "while the needs of the Church at large are not overlooked."

Most of the first section of Chapter Two can be read as a job description for the modern bishop. Article 12 is devoted to the bishop's task of teaching, again with a confusion about any difference between teaching and preaching which we observed in our comments on Article 25

6. Many Italian dioceses would be a case in point, and their continued existence must call into question how seriously this is taken by the Italian hierarchy.

6a. See P. Rudge, Ministry and Management (London, 1971).

of Lumen Gentium. This article, however, contains a description of preaching which the earlier one lacks, although it is used as a description of the teaching function which, says the article, should include the proclamation of the gospel of Christ to men, "a task which is eminent among the chief duties of bishops" (quod inter praecipua Episcoporum munera eminet).

...eos in Spiritus fortitudine ad fidem vocantes aut in fide viva confirmantes; integrum Christi mysterium ipsis proponant, illas nempe veritates quarum ignorantia, Christi ignorantia est, itemque viam quae divinitus revelata est ad glorificationem Dei atque eo ipso ad beatitudinem aeternam consequendam.

They should, in the power of the Spirit, summon men to faith or confirm them in a faith already living. They should expound the whole mystery of Christ to them, namely, those truths the ignorance of which is ignorance of Christ. At the same time they should point out the divinely revealed way to give glory to God and thus attain to everlasting bliss.

This seems to me to be a definition of preaching that is in accord with the greatest traditions of classical Protestantism: the proclamation of the mighty acts of God in Jesus Christ under the influence of the Spirit with the intent of stirring up faith. It is, in classical evangelical terms, "preaching for a decision." Teaching, as distinguished from preaching, is the nurture provided for those who have chosen "the divinely revealed way to give glory to God" and the attempt to relate that "way" to life's daily decisions, joys, and sorrows, as well as to relate ethical choices and styles of life to that "way." The fathers very quickly brought home the implications of the nurture that must follow upon preaching and proclamation: "They should show, moreover, that earthly goods and human institutions structured according to the plan of God the Creator are also related to man's salvation, and therefore can

contribute much to the upbuilding of Christ's Body." Then follows a list of those concerns for which the bishop should provide leadership in right thinking: "the human person with his freedom and bodily life, the family and its unity and stability, the procreation and education of children, civil society with its laws and professions, labor and leisure, the arts and technical invention, poverty and affluence." It is, in effect, a catalog of those concerns which were paramount in the early sixties. A Protestant thinker would tend to distinguish as I have done between "preaching" as the proclamation of the essence of the gospel which is eternal, and "teaching" as the application of gospel precepts to daily living because he would tend to see the applications as relative to time and culture.⁷ Roman theologians, with more dependence upon natural theology, would not be as precise about distinguishing between the two because "truth" is being proclaimed in both cases. Surely it is that assurance of being the guardian of the truth, natural as well as revealed, which enables the fathers finally to say that among the other duties of bishops "they should set forth the ways by which are to be solved (quibus solvendae sunt) the very grave questions concerning the ownership, increase, and just distribution of material goods, peace and war, and brotherly relations among all peoples"! It is certainly clear that the fathers saw the function of preaching as related to the whole of life and they were not about to tolerate the proclamation of

7. C.H. Dodd, The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments (New York, 1936), pp. 7-35; P. Menoud, "Preaching," in Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible (New York, 1962), vol. 3, pp. 868-69; A. Richardson, A Theological Word Book of the Bible (London, 1957), pp. 171-72

any facile plan of salvation divorced from the realities of daily life.

Article 13 is concerned with the need to employ the most modern and efficient means of communication to transmit the Church's message and teaching about the application of the gospel to modern life. Doctrine should be presented in "a manner adapted to the needs of the times, that is to say, in a manner corresponding to the difficulties and problems by which people are most vexatiously burdened and troubled." Special attention is to be paid to the needs of "the poor and the lower classes to whom the Lord sent them to preach the gospel." Article 14 then follows naturally by emphasizing the bishop's duty to provide for proper catechetical instruction. This involves using methods "appropriate to the matter that is being treated and to the natural disposition, ability, age, and circumstances in life of the listener." Such instruction is to be "based on sacred Scripture, tradition, the liturgy, the teaching authority, and life of the Church." Consequently, bishops are to "take care that catechists be properly trained for their task, so that they will be thoroughly acquainted with the doctrine of the Church and will have both a theoretical and a practical knowledge of the laws of psychology and of pedagogical methods."

Article 15 is devoted to a consideration of the bishops' task of sanctification. Whereas the Constitution on the Church emphasized that the bishop acts in the role of Christ in the community, here the bishop is cast in the role of the representative of the community before God. Lumen Gentium is then cited in terms of the bishops' role as "princip^{al} dispensers of the mysteries of God" and "guardians of the entire litur-

gical life." Presbyters are only mentioned as being "prudent fellow workers of the episcopal order," but while they are "true priests of the New Testament," they are dependent upon the bishop who alone enjoys "the fullness of the sacrament of orders" for their authority. Nor are the concerns of holiness neglected in the bishops' concern for sanctifying. Sanctification must extend to the lives of all the faithful as a result of the sanctifying action which takes place upon the altar. Bishops are to "give an example of holiness through charity, humility, and simplicity of life" and are to "be diligent in fostering holiness among their clerics, religious, and laity according to the special vocation of each."

Article 16 deals with the implications of the episcopal office of father and pastor. He is to "mold the whole family of his flock" in terms of forming a community of love where each is conscious of his duties and is supported by them. The bishop is to "arrange his life in such a way as to accommodate it to the needs of the time." He "should regard his priests as sons and friends," having time for them individually and being concerned about the entire scope of their welfare. He is to employ social research in order to understand the nature and needs of his flock more fully, and he is to "deal lovingly with the separated brethren" and foster "ecumenism as it is understood by the Church."

Article 17 continues in the same vein, encouraging the bishop to foster all forms of the apostolate, and Article 18 calls attention to the needs of special groups such as "seamen, airplane personnel, gypsies (maritimi ... aeronavigantes, nomades) and others of this kind."

Article 19 declares that bishops "of themselves enjoy full and perfect freedom, and independence from any civil authority." They are to be concerned for "social and civil progress and prosperity," and they are to "advocate obedience to just laws and reverence for legitimately constituted authorities," but in no way are they to be hindered in that which concerns the salvation of souls, and that includes free communication with the Apostolic See. In the same tone, Article 20 stresses that the nomination and appointment of bishops belongs solely "to the competent ecclesiastical authority" and that civil authorities should no longer have any rights in the matter.

Finally, the fathers possibly having examined the catalog thus compiled of episcopal duties, ~~they~~ suggest in Article 20 that retirement or resignation with suitable support to follow should be expected as bishops "become less capable of fulfilling their duties properly."

The third section of Chapter Two discusses the relationship of the bishop to those with whom he works in the diocese. The place of coadjutor and assistant bishops is defined as being necessary "because the diocesan bishop cannot personally fulfill all his episcopal duties as the good of souls demands." No mention is made of the place they share with the diocesan in the college of bishops by virtue of their consecration and hierarchical communion, a fact emphasized in Lumen Gentium, but it is decreed that they "should be granted those faculties necessary for rendering their work more effective and for safe-guarding the dignity proper to bishops." They are always to "manifest obedience and reverence" towards the diocesan, and he in turn should have a "fraternal love" for

them and "hold them in esteem."

The sub-section on the diocesan curia concludes by suggesting that it is "highly desirable" that a pastoral council, presided over by the bishop, be established with membership taken from the clergy, religious, and laity. It is "to investigate and to weigh matters which bear on pastoral activity, and to formulate practical conclusions regarding them." The sub-section on the diocesan clergy underlines the importance of the "one presbytery and one family, whose father is the bishop." It mandates the suppression of any rights or privileges which will interfere with the freedom of the bishop in appointing pastors. The relation of the bishop with his clergy is always to be judged by the criterion of the good of souls, clergy and laity together.

The sub-section on the relation of the bishop to the religious in his diocese is of particular interest in light of the historic friction which has existed, as we saw in the last chapter. Religious priests are not to be seen as independent of the diocesan because they, too, "are consecrated for the office of the presbyterate so that they may be the prudent cooperators of the episcopal order." Because of the mutual burden of caring for souls, said the fathers, "in a certain genuine sense (vera quadam ratione) they must be said to belong to the clergy of the diocese." The fathers enumerated six principles which they considered to be "fundamental" in the relation between bishops and religious "in order that the works of the apostolate be carried out harmoniously in individual dioceses and that the unity of diocesan discipline be preserved intact." (1) Religious should be at the service of the bishops

because the bishops are the successors to the apostles. "Whenever they are legitimately" (but what is legitimate is not defined) "called upon to undertake works of the apostolate, they are obliged to discharge their duties in such a way that they may be available and docile helpers (adsint et subsint) to bishops." The decree then says that if the constitutions of houses make this difficult, the constitutions "should be adapted" (accommodentur). (2) Bishops, on the other hand, have an obligation to support the spirit of community life and the duty of obedience to superiors. (3) Exemption by the pope is seen as a means of ordering the internal life of the community and to use its resources to the best advantage of the universal Church. It is not intended that exemption should exclude them "from the jurisdiction of the bishop ... insofar as the performance of his pastoral office and the right ordering of the care of souls require." (4) There is no exemption from the authority of the Ordinary where the ordering of public worship is concerned or any other matter pertaining to the care of souls such as religious education, preaching, pastoral work, and clerical decorum (clericalis decorem), nor is there any exemption from the authority of episcopal conferences in matters they "legitimately" (again not strictly defined) "prescribe for universal obedience." (5) Bishops are also to see that there is a "well-ordered cooperation" between the religious and the diocesan clergy. (6) Bishops and religious superiors should meet periodically to discuss the common concerns of the apostolate in their territory.

The third and final chapter of the decree, "Concerning the Cooper-

ation of Bishops for the Common Good of Many Churches," is important primarily because it gives a firm mandate for the establishment of episcopal conferences. On the basis of the example of the bishops in the early centuries who "pooled their resources and unified their plans for the common good" the council desired "that the venerable institution of synods and councils flourish with new vigor." It is interesting to note that nothing about the college of bishops is mentioned as a justification for such action. This is because the college always refers to the complete number of bishops in the Church. An action by a national conference can never participate in the same kind or quality of decision that is peculiar to the college with the pope at its head. But the establishment of national and regional synods with specified directions for them served to illustrate the independence the bishops felt belonged to them by virtue of their office and responsibility for government in their dioceses. Because the function of government is in the hands of the diocesans, only they and coadjutors must have a deliberative vote. Other bishops are permitted such at the discretion of the individual conference, but papal legates "in view of their particular assignment" (ob singulare quod obeunt) do not have membership in a national conference. By its section on "Bishops with an Inter-diocesan Office" the council recognized that the function of episkope must involve more than diocesan supervision. This was seen most clearly in the case of concern for military personnel, but the principle was stated on a broader level.

1c. A Summary of Vatican II's Theory and Practice of Episcopacy

Chapter Three of Lumen Gentium is important because it is the only official statement produced by the Roman church on the nature of the episcopacy. It provided the theological basis for the recommendations contained in Christus Dominus and was a source for the compilers of the new Pontifical. It would be well then to reduce it to a concise summary, using the exact words of the document as much as possible to avoid misinterpretations and culling out all references intended as justification or evidence in support of positions taken. The following paragraph is an attempt to state in the words of the council just what it said about the episcopate in Lumen Gentium. It might serve as an unofficial "authoritative definition" by which to examine the new consecration rite in the next chapter. The numbers refer to the particular article from which the terms employed are taken.

The episcopacy is a servant ministry	Ministri ... inserviunt (18)
instituted by Christ	Christus ... instituit (18)
in a hierarchically structured society.	societate hierarchice ordinata (20)
Its members are successors of the apostles	successoribus Apostolorum (18)
in a sequence running back to the beginning.	per successionem ab initio decurrentem (20)
Together with the successor of Peter and never without him	qui cum successore Petri (18) numquam sine hoc Capite (22)
they, by virtue of sacramental consecration,	vi sacramentalis consecrationis (22)

are incorporated into a college
and share with him in the
government of the Church.

As members of the episcopal college
they exemplify the diversity of the
Catholic Church, and in their dio-
ceses they are symbolic of its unity.

Bishops act in the person of Christ
and undertake his role as Teacher,
Shepherd, and High Priest.

As teachers, in matters of faith
and morals

they speak in the name of Christ
and the faithful are to accept this
teaching with a religious assent of
soul,

for the infallibility promised to
the Church resides with them

when with the pope they exercise
the supreme teaching authority.

They govern in their particular dio-
ceses as vicars of Christ

and not as representatives of the
pope,

although they are subject to the
full, supreme, and universal power
of the pontiff

and must be in hierarchical
communion with him.

Through their sacramental consecra-
tion they possess the fullness of
the sacrament of orders

and so are responsible for the
priestly ministry

by conferring that sacrament in
various degrees

Membrum Corporis episcopalis (22)

qui cum ...
domum Dei viventis regunt (18)

varietatem ... exprimit (22)

visibile principium ... unitatis (23)

in Eius persona agant (21)

ipsius Christi Magistri,
Pastoris et Pontificis
partes sustineant (21)

de fide
et moribus (25)

nomine Christi (25)

religioso animi obsequio
adhaerere debent (25)

Infallibilitas Ecclesiae promissa
in corpore Episcoporum quoque
inest (25)

quando supremum magisterium cum
Petri Successore exercet (25)

Episcopi ...
ut vicarii ... Christi regunt (27)

neque vicarii Romanorum Pontificum
putandi sunt (27)

plenam, supremam et universalem
potestatem, quam semper libere
exercere valet (22)

hierarchica
communione cum Collegii Capite (22)

episcopali consecratione
plenitudinem conferri
sacramenti Ordinis (21)

Omnis ... legitima Eucharistiae
celebratio dirigitur ab Episcopo (26)

vario gradu ...
tradiderunt (28)

upon their helpers, the priests
and deacons,
and supervising their labors.

cum adiutoribus presbyteris
et diaconis (20)

Episcopi sacrum ius ... habent ...
omnia, quae ad cultus apostolatus-
que ordinem pertinent, moderan-
di (27)

The high priestly duty of
sanctification
extends to their manner of life
and so they are called to be an
influence for good.

Episcopalis ... consecratio, cum
munere sanctificandi (21)

exemplo conversationis suae (26)

ad bonum commutando (26)

If Lumen Gentium is an exercise in systematic theology, a statement of what should be believed about the nature of the episcopal office, then Christus Dominus is an exercise in practical theology, a statement as to how the word of God present in the bishop is to find incarnation in the modern world. In an attempt to summarize what the council fathers thought were primary for the twentieth-century episcopal agenda, I have isolated twenty-six items which are listed below with the article number that is their source. I have not included any statements about the meaning of the episcopate. Those are mostly taken from Lumen Gentium anyway, as the basis on which episcopal action is to occur. The purpose of Christus Dominus was to detail what the bishops were to do in their pastoral office, not what they were to think about it. I have not here cited the Latin text because the decree is not of the same nature as the constitution, and because there is less danger of any subjective interpretation being imposed on these rather forthright statements.⁸ As with the dogmatic constitu-

8. I am aware that the last item is open to the charge of being a "thought" mandate rather than a "doing" one, but I feel it should be included because

tion, it will be instructive in the next chapter to see to what degree these applications, in a general or specific way, found a place in the new Roman Pontifical.

After a brief summary of the theological arguments of Lumen Gentium, the council fathers declared that because they were "attentive to the developments in human relations, which have brought about a new order of things in our time"⁹ they wished to issue decrees "to determine more exactly the pastoral office of bishops."¹⁰ Those decrees would have the following effects upon the life and work of a bishop.

1. All bishops have a right to be present at an ecumenical council (4).
2. There is to be a Synod of Bishops to assist the pope (5).
3. Bishops are to share personnel and finances with missions and other dioceses in need (6).
4. Bishops are to identify with and work for fellow-bishops suffering persecution (7).
5. The Roman Curia is to be re-organized and internationalized (9, 10).
6. In his preaching, the bishop is to relate "earthly goods and human institutions ... to man's salvation," and that in specifically enumerated ways (12).
7. Bishops are to present doctrine "in a manner adapted to the needs of the times" (13).
8. "Bishops are the principal dispensers of the mysteries of God ... and guardians of the entire liturgical life" (15).
9. Bishops are to foster holiness in others and give an example to others by "charity, humility, and simplicity of life" (15).
10. They are to foster religious and priestly vocations (15).
11. They are to arrange their lives according to the needs

it is used as the basis on which action should proceed in the liturgical life and because it requires the bishop to think of himself in an image that is totally ignored in the dogmatic constitution.

9. "attentis ... condicionibus hominum consociationis, quae nostra hac aetate, ad novum fertur rerum ordinem"

10. "pressius determinare ... pastorale Episcoporum munus"

of the time (16).

12. Their interest in their priests should be both personal and professional (16, 28-31).

13. They are to make themselves aware of the sociological realities of their dioceses and provide a ministry in accordance with them (16-18).

14. They are to be ecumenically open (16).

15. They are to be concerned for the non-baptized (16).

16. They are to promote and encourage the lay apostolate (17).

17. They are to support proper civil authority while remaining independent of it (19-20).

18. A bishop is to recognize when he has become incapable of fulfilling the demands of his office and submit his resignation (21).

19. Auxiliaries, coadjutors, and diocesans are expected to work in mutual respect and harmony (25).

20. The bishop should organize and preside over diocesan councils that are representative of the whole people (27).

21. He is to oversee within the framework of law all the works of religious within his diocese and employ them for legitimate needs (33-34).

22. He is to consult regularly with religious superiors on matters of common concern (34).

23. He is to participate in regional synods (37).

24. He is to cooperate with those bishops who have inter-diocesan responsibilities (42).

25. He is to use "the welfare of souls" as his criterion for the government of his diocese (30, 34).

26. He is to be mindful that he functions as the representative of the faithful before God (15).

The comprehensiveness of the decree makes it evident that no bishop can fulfill his responsibilities without a great measure of dependence upon his auxiliaries (if he have any) and upon the presbytery and people as well. This can mean in practice that the bishop ceases to be the diocesan monarch who orders every move in every area of the apostolate,

and he becomes in a truer sense one who exercises episkope over the initiative and charisms of others.

2. The Ordained Ministry in Ecumenical Perspective

This "agreed Statement of the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches"¹¹ is the result of deliberations about the nature of ordained ministry that may be said to have begun at Edinburgh in 1910 and continued through a series of meetings and conversations for the rest of the century.¹² The statement received its final approval from the Commission at its Accra meeting in 1974 and was published in 1975 as part of the Faith and Order Paper No. 73, One Baptism, One Eucharist, and a Mutually Recognised Ministry. While its statements about the episcopacy as such are relatively few, they are set in the context of wider statements about the meaning and function of ordination in the Christian community that must of necessity bear upon our understanding of who the bishop is or ought to be in the midst of that community. I propose first to examine the general statements made about Christian ministry as they may be relevant to our discussion of episcopacy, then the statements about the rite of ordination in order that they may be part of the criteria we use in evaluating recent rites in the next chapter, and, finally, to look at what the document says in particular about the ministry of episkope

11. The text employed here is that found on pp. 109-41 in Modern Ecumenical Documents on the Ministry (London, 1975).

12. These conversations are reflected in the successive Faith and Order reports. A major publication in 1937 was The Ministry and the Sacraments, edited by R. Dunkerley. A glance at it will indicate how far the issues had both advanced and changed in perspective by the time of Accra almost forty years later.

and the relation of the episcopal order to it.

The Preamble begins by placing all ministry firmly in the tradition of servanthood which begins with the ministry of Jesus "who came 'not to be served but to serve.'" Such a ministry is also located within the Christian community and therefore cannot be understood apart from the nature of the Church. The Church is an apostolic community in that it is grounded in Jesus Christ, the original Apostle sent from God and whose ministry is continued by his apostles as they proclaim his word of reconciliation and become the foundation of the community. As an institution in history the Church's apostolicity "is sustained primarily by Christ's continued presence in it through the activity of the Holy Spirit."

It is of fundamental importance to take note of the document's insistence upon the historical and sociological conditioning of the community and the resultant forms of ministry it adopts. Par. 7 states the position explicitly.

The Christian community always exists in a concrete sociological setting. Therefore, it cannot be described adequately in general theological terms. As we reflect on the nature of the community and on the place of the special ministry in the community its actual sociological appearance must be taken into account. Obviously, the forms of the community have changed in the course of history; and as the special ministry is to serve the community in its concrete form, the patterns of the ministry have changed and must change as well.

This theme is repeated in Pars. 23 and 24 where it is stated that the form taken by the ordained ministry in any church tradition is due in part to "the changing patterns of society" and "the Church's response in the Spirit to those changing patterns in the social environment."

Diversity in forms of ministry "is bound up with ... history and cultural particularity." The consequence of such conditioning is that "as human society changes, the Church is called to seek a new obedience to God in the new situation" and "its capacity for change is a measure of the vitality of the Church and its ministry" (pars. 70-71). The statement guards against embracing a wholly relativist or historicist position however, because "the limits of ministerial diversity are determined by the apostolic commission, the action of the Holy Spirit, and the fact that major patterns of leadership in society are not infinitely variable" (par. 24).

Such a statement about the origins of the forms of ministry is in marked contrast to those of Vatican II. Christus Dominus would certainly agree with the use of sociological research to help identify areas for ministry in the modern world, but Lumen Gentium provides no evidence that the "hierarchically structured society" is more an accident of history and culture than it is God's plan for his people from the beginning. The two questions at issue in these positions are whether episcopacy is by divine revelation the form of government God wills for his Church, or is it a functional office that emerged according to the governmental patterns of the times and therefore may be altered by the Church as the times continue to change. Any ecumenical discussion concerning mutual recognition of ministries, particularly the episcopacy, must find reconciliation between these divergent opinions.

The special ministry within the Christian community is apostolic because it continues the work of the first apostles, an essential work

of proclaiming the message of reconciliation, establishing churches, and building them up in the faith. Such labors are as essential now as at the beginning. As Christ commissioned the original apostles he, through the Holy Spirit, continues to call persons to the special ministry to work in concert with the whole community in servanthood to the needs of the whole world. This special ministry also serves as a sign of "the priority of divine initiative and authority in the Church's existence" (14). Its specific service is "to assemble and build up the Christian community, by proclaiming and teaching the word of God, and presiding over the liturgical and sacramental life of the eucharistic community" (15). Such a description would compare agreeably with the distinction made in the bishops' roles by Vatican II of governor, prophet, and priest.

If the special ministry is a "sign of the priority of divine ... authority," then it follows that it is called to exercise authority in the community. Again, there is some difference between what is intended by the framers of this document when they speak of "authority" and that of Vatican II. For the latter the authority of the episcopate is directly, divinely conveyed through ordination. It is an authority over the People of God who are bound in faith to give "religious assent" to episcopal teaching and direction. The WCC document does maintain that by ordination comes consecration to service in the Church and "authority for its exercise" (17); it also acknowledges the divine nature of the authority "in that it belongs to Christ who has received it from the Father" (18). The striking point of difference is that the authority

at the same time "belongs to the whole community in and for which one is ordained" (18). It is not an individual possession to be exercised apart from the community of faith or over the community, but in a tension with the community which calls for "interdependence and reciprocity" (19). This means that the ordained and the community for which he is ordained must be in a continual dialogue concerning mutual expectations and understandings of the missions of the Church at any given place or time. The document discusses this in terms of the role of the local minister in relation to his congregation, but the applications to the episcopate are equally valid and needful. To illustrate, the following passages from the document have been altered to use episcopal and diocesan terminology in place of the original pastor and congregation references. Words or phrases so altered are underlined.

...Any doctrine of the ministry conveys the image of a role which the bishop has to fulfil in the Christian community. As he accepts consecration he approaches the diocese with his own understanding of his task. He will soon discover, however, that the actual expectations of the clergy and the laity who may themselves not be agreed differ from his own understanding. He needs to take these expectations into account.

Bishops experiencing such tension face a difficult dilemma. Either they adhere to their vision of the episcopacy and alienate the diocese, or they adjust to the role they are actually expected to play and experience feelings of guilt.

In many situations the discrepancy between the bishop's understanding of his role and the expectations which his diocese may have, conceals deeper tensions of which neither may be fully aware. Thus the clergy and/or laity may actually want of their bishop something substantially different from what they say they want. Again what the bishop in fact does may be different from what he thinks he is doing.
(72-74)

This tension is seen as healthy for the community and an instrument for renewal if the parties involved are honest about the conflicts they face and are committed to living within creative tension. Such a situation does not appear on the face of it to have the capacity for efficiency that the hierarchical structure of Vatican II still maintains and where, one may suspect, liberal bishops do not hesitate to use the privileges of power protected by conservatives if it will assist them to achieve what they consider to be worthwhile ends. Yet the effectiveness of the hierarchical structure exists only as long as there are those who are willing to admit the hierarchy as legitimate. Mounting evidence indicates that it will take more than the assertions of Lumen Gentium to convince a new generation of Roman Catholics that a hierarchical structure may still provide a place of dignity for the laity. The Christian community envisaged by the WCC statement is a voluntary society which is able to maintain its unity only as long as each section respects the unique gifts and character of the others. It may be said to be a differentiated society, but not a hierarchical one.

The minister's authority comes from Christ, yet it also belongs to the congregation.¹³ The minister is a sign of the prior authority of God in the life of the community. This surely indicates that there is some difference in the quantity or quality of the authority borne by the representative through ordination of the activity of God in the midst of his people. It is not an authority which can be either autocratic or

13. The question of authority will continue to be raised in this chapter. Two important recent studies that apply to my use of the term are J. Dominion, Authority (London, 1976), and N. Lash, Voices of Authority (London, 1976).

impersonal, since it is based on the concept of servanthood, but authority that is not exercised is hardly authority, and the nominal holder of it sooner or later comes to be disregarded at best or despised at worst. The document poses the problem in these words: "As all ministerial authority ultimately belongs to Christ, and the essential quality of all ministry is to be service, the minister has to ask himself how far he is justified in insisting upon his position over against the congregation by referring to his ordination" (78). The document gives no real answer to that question, but it does talk about the meaning of ordination, the conditions under which it should be administered, and what should be considered proper to the act itself. We will now turn to examine those and see how they might be applied to episcopal ordination and to the question of episcopal function and authority.

Ordination first of all attests the bond of the Church with Jesus Christ who is the true ordainer, and with the apostolic witness. Imposition of hands is the sign of the gift of the Spirit (38). This is to recognize simply that the source of all priestly ministry is the one Priest, Jesus Christ, whose saving activity continues in the community by the power of the Spirit. The authority through ordination, as was emphasized above, is an authority belonging to Christ, but because it also belongs to the whole People of God they must also be involved in the entire ordination process. This involves much more than a pro forma response written into the liturgy for the occasion. It means being involved from the first in the selection, approval, education, and nur-

turing of candidates for the ordained ministry. This should apply no less to those being considered for the episcopacy than to those who are just beginning on the path to the diaconate. Ordination is not seen as a transfer to a superior status in the community, but the granting of a trust of authority by the people to individuals to do that work of service and ministry which has been given to them all in baptism. An obvious implication of this for the episcopacy is that the people of a diocese should have confidence in the process by which a bishop is chosen, since it is hardly possible that a popular vote by all communicant members in a diocese will be a pattern adopted by many churches.¹⁴

The WCC document further points out that the act of ordination should occur within a eucharistic context in order to emphasize again the communal aspect of what is taking place (each person participating in the liturgical assembly in respect of his particular calling within it), and in order to refer the whole event to God who in Christ came in the servant-role and who continues to be the host at the eucharistic banquet as he equips his people for their servant-role in the world.

Five basic conditions are declared to be indispensable for admission to ordination, and again we should read them with an eye to their applic-

14. To say this is not to exclude it as an option, and I see no reason why it could not be made workable. I suspect, however, that the fear of "politicizing" the episcopacy by making it the creature of a popular election would discourage its use. Only the most naive would believe that the choice of a bishop in any denomination by whatever selection process is devoid of political ramifications and maneuvering, but there is still a belief that it is somehow "cleaner" politics in the rarified atmosphere of a smaller body of electors, the known history of the college of cardinals notwithstanding.

ability to the episcopate. These conditions are generally met in the examination of the candidate during the liturgical service. But such questions are merely a means of affirming publicly what should have been ascertained about the candidate prior to his election, insofar as is humanly possible. It is stated first that "the ordinand should be one who has a call from the Lord to dedicate himself to the particular style of ministry implied in ordination" (51). The paragraph goes on to list ways in which the call may be discerned in the life of the ordinand. Nothing is said about election as a mode of the call, although this could be assumed under the function of the Christian community to recognize those within it who are called to service.

Secondly, "the ordinand should be one whom the Church can confidently expect to commit himself to the task for which he is called and ordained" (52). Such a task must "bear a close relation to the Church's mission," and "will largely consist in gathering and building up some form of missioning Christian community."

Third, the ordinand should have the capability of executing his tasks "in informed fidelity to the gospel" (53). This is to involve an "adequate study of Scripture and theology" and a "sufficient acquaintance with the social and human realities of the actual situation." One should note here the striking agreement with the decrees of Christus Dominus. As the visible representative of the tradition of the apostles among his people, the bishop must be able to interpret that tradition through the proclamation of the word, and he must know his sheep intimately enough to apply that word where it will intersect with their lives

and bring healing and hope. This raises the secondary question of job-training for bishops. To explore those issues is not within the scope of this thesis, but it should be mentioned in passing as a corollary to the quest for an informed and pastorally aware episcopate. We will see in our examination of the 1978 Lambeth Conference that those bishops felt the need for some such preparation before beginning to exercise the episcopal office.

Fourth, the ordinand "should be one endowed with such basic gifts of the Spirit as faithfulness and reliability, prayerfulness and patience, endurance, courage, humility, and hope" (54). Exactly how the presence of such gifts is to be determined by anything other than hindsight is not clear, and the framers of the document offer no hints. I would assume, however, that it is easier to determine these by the previous fruits of the ministry of a more experienced priest who is elected to the episcopacy than it is with seminarians who are candidates for the ministry. The theological issue here is to what degree those gifts are to be in the candidate from the beginning and to what degree they are given to the candidate in response to his faithfulness in answering the call of Christ and the Church to office. The candidate should certainly have gifts and graces which qualify him to stand for election, but the prayer of the Church at his consecration is intended also to increase those gifts through the power of the Spirit. This issue will be raised again when we examine the document's criteria for the rite of ordination itself.

Finally, the ordinand should "be able to live and act in a relation-

ship of mutual accountability and concern" (55). This is a reflection of the shared authority that is inherent in the baptized People of God as a whole and that is committed to the bishop in a special way through his consecration as a representative minister of and for those People. Once again, no details are given as to how this mutual accountability is to be determined. Does it involve a "job description" that can be evaluated from year to year? Does that in turn mean that as the needs of a diocese change it is permissible to change bishops in order to procure personnel with the gifts and graces most suited to the new situation? Or can on the job training provide "re-tooling" for a bishop to meet the changed environment? To what degree is this approach, adapted from the secular world of institutional management, in danger of quenching the Spirit? How far is the bishop justified in imposing his character on the face of his diocese? And, finally, does this approach really mean that the bishop is always accountable because he is one and easily available for evaluation, but that the "whole People" are really immune because of the difficulty of imposing "sanctions" if they fail to meet what the bishop has been led to believe are their obligations in the relationship? Obviously there are no easy answers, and the document has not provided any.

The rite of ordination itself is described as having three parts: an invocation to God for the gift of the Spirit (epiclesis) (45), a sacramental sign of the granting of the prayer (46), and an acknowledgment by the Church of spiritual gifts in the ordained and a commitment by Church and ordinand to the responsible use of those gifts (47).

The epiclesis implies three things. First, that the ordinand has come into a new relation to the local Christian community, to the Church universal, and to the world. Exactly what that relation is would depend upon the nature of the call to diaconate, presbyterate, or episcopate, and that is not defined in this document apart from what is said about the all-embracing character of servanthood. "New relation" would imply a change in the nature and character of that servanthood so far as it involves a new role of authority and leadership. Nothing is said about the Catholic doctrine of the indelible character of orders, but one wonders if a case could not be made for it on the basis of the "new relation." The document never touches on the question of the duration of ministry, except to say that special ministry "is essential in all times and circumstances" (13). But is it necessary^{ly} for the lifetime of one individual? The statement as it stands is open to either a very functional interpretation of ministry or to one which could conceivably include the indelible character. Also, such a term as "new relation" would not exclude a doctrine of episcopacy as containing the fullness of order which is shared in varying degrees by deacons and presbyters.

The epiclesis also acknowledges "the otherness of God's initiative, of which the ordained ministry is a symbol." This is to say that the call of God is primary and that the Church is unable to invoke the Spirit without evidence that God has already been at work in the nurturing of a person for special ministry in the Church. It may be here that we should find a decisive reason for the effective exercise of special authority by the bishop, even though the authority he bears belongs to the whole Church.

The ministry as a symbol of God's initiative becomes meaningless unless it is able to participate in that reality which it is to signify and thus exercise initiative on its own. This means that the episcopal office should be so understood by the people that it will be able to radiate all the power of a symbol, because the people give meaning and power to it, while at the same time it must be independent enough not to be reduced to the status of a symbolic power.

This independence of episcopal action is also the result of the third consequence of the epiclesis. To invoke the Spirit "implies an absolute dependence on God for the outcome of the Church's prayer." It is to say that the people are unable to foresee the possibilities inherent in the office or the man who occupies it, but having trusted God to assist them in calling that man forth, they will now trust him to use the bishop in his office in ways that will edify the whole People of God. This is not to be construed as governing by divine right, or even with that magisterial authority described in Lumen Gentium, and certainly what has been said already about shared authority should prevent such an interpretation. What it does maintain is that the people should give evidence of their trust in God's superintendence by believing in the good will and faithful intentions of that one whom they, by the Spirit's direction, have chosen to be their overseer.

An ordination rite also signifies that the Lord of the Church who gives the gift of ministry has heard and answered the prayer.

Although the outcome of the Church's epiclesis depends on the freedom of God, the Church ordains in confidence that God, being faithful to his promise in Christ, enters sacramentally into contingent, historical forms of human re-

lationship and uses them for his purpose. Ordination is a sign performed in faith that the spiritual relationship signified is present in, with, and through the words spoken, the gestures made and the ecclesiastical forms employed. (46)

Ordination, then, is not so much the process of creating a minister as recognizing that a ministry has been given. If it has a sacramental quality it is a visible proclamation of what God has done and is doing in the midst of his people, and in ordination the proclaimers of the word become a proclamation of the word. It is this statement that protects the Church's traditional affirmation that the validity or efficacy of sacraments does not depend upon the personal life of the minister. It is the Church's humble recognition of the humility of God that he works faithfully in the midst of our unfaithfulness, and that the treasure of the gospel is always contained in earthen vessels, no matter how externally pure they may seem to be. The Church, in ordination, is not affirming that bad men make as good ministers as less bad men, but that Christ, the primary Priest and Minister, is a faithful servant to his people, and it is his ministry we exalt and proclaim in human ordinations. Or, as Nicholas Lash has suggested in another context, the contention that the Church survives and the sacraments are celebrated ex opere operato might be more happily expressed by ex opere operantis Christi.¹⁵

The third characteristic of an ordination rite is that it is an acknowledgement by the Church of the spiritual gifts present in the ordained and that the Church and ordinand commit themselves to a responsible use of those gifts in "the tests and opportunities implied in the new re-

15. His Presence in the World (London, 1974), p. 113

lationship." This again bears directly on our earlier discussion of the nature of the shared authority. Because the Church recognizes that an individual has been given particular gifts for ministry there is implied an openness to the use of those gifts. He who receives the gifts must at the same time realize that he only has them in trust for the use of the community. The new authority and responsibility he has is referred to as a "burden and opportunity." To call it a burden is to be realistic about the challenge of leadership in modern society; to call it an opportunity is to display faith in the Lordship of a crucified Christ.

The Accra statement has little to say about episcopal ministry specifically, but what it does say is included in its second section, "Apostolic Succession." It is important for us to examine this section to see how far removed it is from the concepts defined in Lumen Gentium and from the theological opinions of many of the Anglican bishops who participated in the 1978 Lambeth Conference and the making of the report we will examine in the next section of this chapter.

Following the description given in the Nicene Creed, though not referring to it, the statement maintains that it is the whole Church which is apostolic, and not merely some isolated part of it. It is "an expression of the permanence and, therefore, continuity of Christ's own mission ..." (27). The Church participates in this continuity by virtue "of the gift of the Holy Spirit in the sending of the apostles and their successors..." Since who those successors precisely are is not expressed, we may assume on the basis of the earlier definition that all the baptized

are the successors.

Criteria are given for discerning "the fullness of the apostolic succession of the whole Church." Continuity is in terms of the "permanent characteristics of the Church of the apostles." Seven characteristics are listed: witness to the apostolic faith, proclamation and fresh interpretation of the apostolic gospel, transmission of ministerial responsibility, sacramental life, community in love, service for the needy, unity among local churches, and sharing the gifts which the Lord has given to each. The ordained ministry is seen "as an authorized and responsible instrument for their preservation and actualization."

All of these marks of the apostolic Church must be present for a church to have "the fullness of the apostolic succession." The document provides no commentary on any of them except that having to do with the transmission of ministerial responsibility. Two things should be noted about it. The first is that such orderly transmission is "both a visible sign of the continuity of the whole Church and of the effective participation of the ministry in it," but the second is that since the purpose of that ministry is to serve the needs of the gospel and not itself, "orderly transmission" may legitimately become "orderly alteration" of the ministerial structures. If the ministry does not "adequately subserve the Church's apostolicity, a church must ask itself whether or not its ministerial structures should continue with no alteration" (29). In other words, the characteristics of the apostolic Church serve as a check upon one another. The ministry not only protects and proclaims the apostolic faith and assists the community in the nurture of Christian

love, but it is liable to the judgment of that faith and love if it fails to minister responsibly to them. There is an "apostolic balance of powers," if you will. Having thus defined apostolic succession in these terms, the statement then considers the place episcopacy may have within that orderly transmission of the ministry.

The difference in the interpretation of history and the use of historical method is perhaps most strikingly highlighted between Accra and Vatican II if we observe in parallel columns the way each deals with the same historical development.

Among those various ministries which, as tradition witnesses, were exercised in the Church from the earliest times, the chief place belongs to the office of those who, appointed to the episcopate in a sequence running back to the beginning, are the ones who pass on the apostolic seed. Thus, as St. Irenaeus testifies, through those who were appointed bishops by the apostles, and through their successors down to our own time, the apostolic tradition is manifested and preserved throughout the world.

Lumen Gentium 20

Under the particular historical circumstance of the growing Church in the sub-apostolic age, the succession of bishops became one of the ways in which the apostolicity of the Church was expressed. This succession was understood as serving, symbolizing, and guarding the continuity of the apostolic faith and communion.

...the New Testament presents diverse types of organization of the Christian communities, according to the difference of authors, places, and times.

(30, 31)

Both positions may understand the emergence of the episcopate to be a historical development; the point at issue between them is whether or not such a development was divinely determined and is continually binding on the Church. Since the Accra document began by saying that the changing patterns of society and the Church's response in the Spirit to them condition the forms ministry will take, it is not surprising that its interpretation of the historical evidence is less rigid. And, therefore,

its understanding of the function of the bishop within the Church will be less rigid. It protests that it does not intend in any way to imply "a devaluation of the emergence and general acceptance of the historic episcopate" (33). It does maintain strongly that "faithfulness to the basic task and structure of the apostolic ministry can be combined with an openness to diverse and complementary expressions of this apostolic ministry."

What must be said in summary is that for the authors of the Accra document the bishop is clearly expendable, but episcopacy (episkope) is not. Where there are bishops in some form of succession, recognized or not by others or one another, they may serve "as an effective sign, not a guarantee, of the continuity of the Church in apostolic faith and mission" (34), but we are not to forget that "episcopal functions and reality have been preserved in many ... churches, with or without the title 'bishop'" (35).

Having defined the bishop as a product of historical circumstances and identified his functions and reality in non-episcopal churches, the authors conclude by saying that "the importance of the historic episcopate has not been diminished by the above-mentioned findings" (37). They feel that it is proper to retain the office "as a pre-eminent sign of the apostolic succession of the whole Church in faith, life, and doctrine, and as such, something that ought to be striven for if absent." And, finally, in what is as close to a negative, dogmatic decree that the document ever comes, it cites with seeming approval the attitude of merger talks where "the only thing they hold as incompatible with con-

temporary historical and theological research is the notion that the episcopal succession is identical with and comprehends the apostolicity of the whole church" (37). Again, it is the "historical research" that interprets the "proclamation and fresh interpretation of the gospel," and not a dogma that gives a particular meaning to a historical event. That difference in technique is the gulf that must be bridged in the continuing ecumenical dialogue with Romans, some Anglicans, and various Protestant communities.

In spite of the doctrinal differences and the differences in the understanding of historical evolution and development, there are a number of points of agreement between Accra and Vatican II. Much of the disagreement is with Lumen Gentium, the "systematic treatise" on the episcopacy; much of the agreement is with Christus Dominus, the "practical theology" statement of Vatican II. The minister/bishop is seen in an apostolic succession in both cases; the disagreement has to do with the "how" of that succession and not recognition of the fact of it. And as a participant in that succession he is a servant of the People of God, sharing in the ministry of Christ the pre-eminent servant. There would be no contradiction by Vatican II of the seven characteristics of apostolicity listed in Accra 29. Roman bishops are expected to be intimately involved in promoting those among their people. In other words, there is little disagreement concerning the functions of episkope as an office in the apostolic church of the first century or the twentieth; the difficulties to be surmounted are the dogmatic ones.

It does appear that Accra is lacking at the point where Vatican II

is strongest, and that is the focus on collegiality, the bishop as a sign of unity among his people and of unity in diversity when he meets in company with other bishops. This may be simply because the Accra document did not have episcopacy primarily in mind since it was intended to discuss the ministry in more general terms. But even when what it says is applied to local pastors (as it intended), there is little if any sense given that they participate in any corporate reality apart from the individual congregations they serve. By ordination they are brought into a "new relation" with "the universal Church," but we are not given any indications as to how. "Unity among local churches" is one of the signs of the fullness of the apostolic church, but how is that signified? If it is to be done by the presbytery, even as one aspect, that is not indicated as a part of the ministerial, let alone the episcopal, function. It is, at any rate, worth considering that the Accra statement may lack a sense of catholic unity (or the need to express it) because it has adopted a historical and dogmatic stance that is willing to dispense with the "sacramental sign" of the bishop as an individual who is called out from among them to be the servant of the servants of God.

3. The 1978 Lambeth Conference

In view of what one had been led to expect from the announced agenda and the material circulated to the bishops in advance of the Conference, Lambeth 1978 produced disappointingly little material on the official level about how Anglicans view the office and work of the episcopacy.

Our examination will be in three parts: the material in the preparatory articles, all of which is unofficial and represents the views of the individual authors only, and was, as the volume states, "designed to inform and stimulate, but not to prescribe"; the report produced by Section 2 of the Conference, that which dealt with "The People of God and Ministry"; and finally the actual resolutions passed in the plenary sessions of the Conference.

3a. Considered Opinions: The Preparatory Articles

Following a tradition begun by Archbishop Ramsey, the participants in the Lambeth Conference were expected to do homework in advance so that they might have already considered some of the issues to be discussed. The title of the work (along with the statements issued by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Anglican Consultative Council) led one to believe that the bishops would attack with all seriousness the meaning of their office and its relevance to the contemporary Church. The full title of the Preparatory Articles was Today's Church and Today's World with a special focus on The Ministry of Bishops.¹⁶ Nine of the thirty-seven articles were concerned with episcopal ministry.

The first article, "Episcopacy in the New Testament and Early Church" (pp. 206-14), by Professor Henry Chadwick, is a concise summary of the results of historical research with conclusions drawn that are similar to those outlined in the first chapter of this thesis. Ministry is seen as a gift of God to the whole Church, and is to perform the dual role of

16. (London, 1977)

service to the local community and of being the visible sign of unity between communities. Prof. Chadwick recognizes that there were diverse forms of ministry in the first century and that the episcopal form emerged gradually to dominate the rest. He discusses the genesis of the doctrine of apostolic succession as the result of the need to hand on safely and to guard the "authenticity of the truth about Jesus," particularly as a result of the gnostic controversies. He emphasizes that in the early Church apostolic succession had to do with being in communion with all the churches and with the transmission of the faith, not with tables of descent, and he contrasts this with the consequences of Augustine's arguments put forward to allow the validity of Donatist baptisms as applied to ordination. In its original context, intended to recognize baptisms outside the Catholic Church, it was "generous," but when applied to orders "it unhappily encouraged men to think of ordination by a bishop in apostolic succession as if this were the exclusive and sole test of ministerial and ecclesial validity" (p. 213). It is his contention that apostolic succession should not be considered a mark of validity (which is to say that the transmission of sacramental grace is mechanical), but of universality, of participation through time and space in apostolic communion. Yet he phrases his conclusions in such a way that there is more than a hint of the "pedigree psychology," in spite of his attempts to avoid it. He speaks, for instance, of the "defect" in a "separated ministry" as the lack of universality. Such language still has a touch of arrogance about it, and the suspicion remains that those who use it still cling to the security of pedigree however defined. When

he says, "...an independent pastorate may indeed be blessed by God as an efficacious means of proclaiming the gospel; but if it rejects communion with the apostolic and catholic tradition, something is lacking" (p. 214), one would like to suggest that something may be lacking in those who reject communio in sacris with others who feel that the efficacious preaching of the gospel is in itself apostolic and catholic. The sentence just quoted indicates to me that in spite of the evidence he has cited from the early Church and the unhappy influence of Augustine it is Prof. Chadwick's considered opinion that "apostolic and catholic" ultimately mean episcopal, and episcopacy with a pedigree. His position remains that of Bishop Gore (p. 132 above).

G.M.D. Howat, in "Sociological Factors that have Shaped Episcopacy" (pp. 215-20), writes much in the vein of the Accra document with its emphasis on the historical and environmental conditioning of ecclesiastical structures. He does not espouse any particular doctrinal position, but simply limits himself to a descriptive task. There have been bishops; what kind of men have they been and why, given the structure of English government and culture? He also recognizes the existence of episcopacy in other Protestant churches, but because he is addressing the bishops of the Anglican communion he does no more than acknowledge that episcopacy concentrated in an individual has found employment elsewhere. One observation is worth deeper exploration by those qualified to do so. In the three sentences he devotes to the Roman episcopate in England he concludes with the statement, "Despite the far-flung nature of the English dioceses, they have been closer to their flocks." One would like

to know why. Mr. Howat has seen and reported accurately the influence society has upon the role of those who exercise leadership in the Church, and when he moves finally to address the question of what kind of bishop should the modern bishop be, it is on the basis of the previous data that he gives as his considered opinion that

Bishops wherever they may be, are overseers; leadership is embodied in their person. It is a vocation not without risk in a world in which the bishop of 1977 walks a tightrope far different from that of his predecessors. In his earnest intent to be seen as a humble man of God, especially by a society which will expect of him a humility compatible with the teaching of the New Testament, he must yet remain the man of standing whose administrative competence, business acumen and personal status allow him to move with ease in the ranks of men and women who lead and govern in secular walks of life. (p. 220)

Does it say something about Mr. Howat's conditioning that his first concern seems to be with the bishop (humble or not) as the associate of those "who lead and govern," rather than as the pastor of those who are led and governed? Might this help provide an answer to the question about the closeness of the Roman bishops to their flocks?

"Religious and Ecclesiastical Factors that have Shaped Episcopacy" (pp. 221-28), by G.V. Bennett, seeks to provide the bishops with a brief historical summary of the development of the episcopate from the close of the patristic age to the present. It deals with most of those developments we examined in Chapter One. The article does seem to contain a contradiction when dealing with the Tractarians. In discussing the appeal to apostolic succession, the author says, "it would perhaps be unjust to them to imagine that their argument stood or fell on the historical fact of an unbroken succession of consecration" (p. 226). Then in the next

paragraph he says, "The Tractarian claim for a ministry within the historic episcopal succession ... tended, however, to be an exclusivist claim. 'We must', wrote J.H. Newman ... 'necessarily consider none to be really ordained who has not thus been ordained.'" The same Tracts he quotes as proof of the exclusivism of the Tractarians provide ample evidence as well that unbroken tactile succession was for them a (if not the) visible sign of the Church's continuity. Were it not for the veneration felt for that sign there would not have arisen the difficulties in the ecumenical movement that Mr. Bennett is describing in that passage. Other than for this apparent contradiction, the article is a straightforward historical summary based upon the most recent historical research. As in the previous article, it is when he comes to the modern period and begins to forecast that we find indications of his point of view. And his point of view seems to be that thinking about the ministry of bishops has become muddled and that the bishops are again facing, to use my term, an identity crisis. He observes that "it sometimes seems that Churches which possess the historic episcopate are better at insisting upon it than defining its use" (p. 227). He feels that the Romans have yet to do an adequate theological study that will clarify the relationship of the bishops to the papacy, diocesan clergy, and laity. For him the primary accomplishment of Vatican II was the definition of collegiality of the bishops qua bishops. He recognizes that the Anglican episcopate has become more prominent in the life of the Church, partly as a result of the Oxford Movement and partly because of increased independence of civil control, but at the same time this has made bishops "less sure of their

role." Because of the attempts to create and maintain an atmosphere of shared authority in synodical government greater emphasis has been placed upon "consultation and consent," with the result "that suitability for the episcopate is now measured by performance in the business of synod or diocesan administration rather than by gifts as a theologian, preacher, or pastor of souls." Yet at the same time there is a growing awareness that simply maintaining oversight of the structures is of little avail "and that more urgent priorities are a renewal of the gospel and a deepening of spirituality." It is this contemporary data which occasions him to give as his considered opinion "that a prime theological task for today is to discover a genuinely apostolic role for bishops." Obviously, for Mr. Bennett, simply to be a bishop is not apostolic enough, but must be defined in terms of mission and response to the needs of the world as "an apostolic man." Does this mean to be on contemporary frontiers and to lead the way, and if so, how is it compatible with nurturing an institution too often committed to its own maintenance?

Having dealt with the origins of and the influences on the episcopal office in the first three essays, the other six deal with the general topic of "The Bishop in Person." How is a man who has inherited all that has been described in the first three essays to identify himself realistically as a servant of God in the twentieth century? What of that inheritance should he hold on to, what discard? Will what is retained have to be re-shaped if it is to be a vehicle for the work of God under contemporary pressures? These are the kinds of questions at the root of the

essays, and their authors in answer provide considered opinions.

Alan Ecclestone is the author of the essay on "The Bishop and His Relationship with God" (pp. 229-35). The essay is devotional in that particular Anglican mode of spirituality which one associates with the writings of Evelyn Underhill. It wages no doctrinal battles and provides no basis for forming any theories of an exclusivist approach to episcopacy. Although Fr. Ecclestone's re-reading of the consecration service is posited as the motivation for the writing of this essay (in epistolary form), it is as applicable to one who shares in the lay apostolate by virtue of his baptism as it is to bishops. He maintains that there is a particularity about being a bishop, but that must be read in the light of his earlier assertion that the bishop stands "with the rest of us in a perspective that makes nonsense of all human distinctions whatsoever and invests the least as well as the greatest with the one glory that is His" (p. 230). But having said that the content of the essay could easily be applied to all Christians in their particular vocations is not to discount its importance for understanding the episcopal role today. The bishop in his office should be a point of concentration that focuses the apostolate and enables all Christians to find their place in it. The bishop, in whatever time or place, is basically to be described as "one sent," and his sending is on the model of the Father sending the Son for the sake of the world. "Apostolic episkope is the continuing re-assertion in human terms, age after age, of the Divine anxiety for a world beset by dangers and imperilled by temptations..." (p. 232). This entails

"mission raised to the highest term of personal involvement" (p. 234). There can be no fixed pattern of a bishop's relationship with God because "true life depends at every turn upon revelation of a quickening relationship with God" (p. 231). Episcopacy, then, means a total involvement in the confusion and contradiction of life in all its change and dynamic. Such involvement for Fr. Ecclestone means that episkope includes insight as well as oversight, the ability not to be "impatient of the temporality of things but charged rather with a heightened awareness of their significance in the eternal order" (p. 233). Nicholas Lash, writing in a Roman context, has said that "at least until the second Vatican Council, the apostolic teaching office of a bishop often seemed to consist not so much in bearing effective witness to belief in concrete situations as in the repetition of ready-made propositions."¹⁷ This essay is an attempt to raise the sights of Anglican bishops to those "concrete situations" in which they live, and to encourage them to find "the new vision." The essay has the weakness of all works dealing with generalized spirituality in that it does not employ particular tests though it speaks a great deal of particularity. The bishops had an opportunity at the Conference in the debate on the ordination of women to decide whether their decisions reflected the precepts of the essay, but unfortunately the essay would provide support for well-intentioned bishops on either side of the issue. Perhaps, then, the first sign of their "quickenings relationship with God" would be the witness of their continuing to act together in love and acceptance.

17. His Presence in the World, p. 8

Bishop Francis Moncreiff (pp. 236-41) writes of the new emphasis on the pastoral role of the bishop and discusses how it can be incorporated into the administrative burden already a part of the episcopal task. And he stresses the need for pastoral leadership in the modern climate of uncertainty about traditional patterns of morality. "All this points not only to the need for pastoral concern but to the areas in which it needs to be exercised. It should operate along the line of reconciliation and should be directed not only towards reconciliation between churches, important as this is, but to maintaining the unity that already exists within the churches" (p. 239). This represents a shift in thinking of the bishop as the sign of unity to the facilitator of unity, and one must wonder if this is possible in view of what the Lambeth resolutions will say later about the prophetic function of the bishop in the wider area of social witness. Is role conflict inevitable if the bishop is to feel that he is failing to maintain unity while he seeks to be faithful to his prophetic office? The ministry of reconciliation must always exist with this tension to some degree, but it also needs to decide what are the urgent priorities. Are they in terms of the disadvantaged and dispossessed who may feel alienated from a church which has allied itself with the forces of power and influence, or are they in terms of those forces themselves? Is there any middle ground? Is the bishop the bridge enabling the two to meet, and if he is, is he then able to take a position which identifies him too completely with either side? Bishop Moncreiff does not seem to recognize these questions, let alone suggest tentative answers.

Lesslie Newbigin (pp. 242-47) lists four aspects of the bishop's involvement in the missionary enterprise of the Church. First, it is the bishop's task to help those who have received from the Spirit different gifts "to honour and accept one another's different ministries" (p. 243). Bishop Newbigin applies this particularly to the current tension between "those on the one hand who see mission in terms of winning individuals to conversion, baptism and church membership, and those on the other hand who see it in terms of action for the doing of God's justice in the life of the world," and says that the bishop "has here a very special task which no one else can perform. It is to seek the healing of this dichotomy." This will surely involve that insight of which Fr. Ecclestone wrote, and must be viewed as part of the pastoral office for which Bishop Moncreiff is concerned. If the bishop is to be the sign of unity in the diocese then it would appear that he must be equally available to all points of view, open to what they represent, and judge them fairly as finding equal support in the scriptures. Such a posture does not absolve the bishop of his prophetic function, nor does it suggest that it will be easier for a bishop to hold a position in good conscience and be respected for his opinion by those who differ from him, even when they know that their difference will not penalize them. This is not to suggest, as Bishop Moncreiff has done, that the bishop is to be the source of unity. He is its sign, and it is to be hoped that he will so understand its importance that he will not intentionally let himself become an obstacle to unity. The bishop is the sign of unity that is based on obedience to the law of

Christ and the guidance of the Spirit, a unity for which all the People of God are responsible through the way in which they care for one another. He should be so open to all his people that they may perceive in him the sign of their unity, but the bishop should not be held responsible for what is the duty of the whole servant community. Nor does Bishop Newbigin ignore the wider dimensions of the bishop's role in missions. In the second place he says, "It is an essential part of a bishop's duty that he should be constantly remembering the true dimensions of his task. He is not called simply to be the bishop of those who are already believers; he is called to leadership in God's mission to the whole human community of his diocese" (p. 245). This is to say that episcopacy is a pioneer ministry and that the bishop must be prepared to lead the way in specific endeavors to bring the healing word of the gospel where it has not penetrated before. Third, the bishop is not simply to encourage such missions. He should be personally involved in them. The bishop should be a recognized presence in the midst of his people, not one who leads his army from the rear. Related to this is his fourth point, that "perhaps the most important element in the bishop's ministry of mission is simply the faith and vigour with which he leads his people in their spiritual warfare" (p. 247). The bishop is to be on the move in such a way that there is no temptation to become at ease in Zion or to conform to the secular pressures of the culture. Bishop Newbigin's own missionary experience is clearly reflected in this essay. He views the Church as operating within an alien environment devoted to other values and goals than those the Church proclaims. If the Western world

has become "post-Christian," then his call to a renewal of the pioneer quality of episcopacy may help greatly in resolving the contemporary episcopal identity crisis isolated in Mr. Howat's essay.

Professor John Macquarrie, in "The Bishop and Theologians" (pp. 248-54), discusses the presumed gap between life in the Church as represented by the bishop and the work being done by theologians. He maintains that where bishops are willing to be enablers of theological dialogue and theologians are willing to devote time in service to the life of the Church the gap is less than it appears. He does not expect that the bishop should be a theologian in the academic, professional sense, but he should be sensitive to theological issues and be willing to make use of theologians in exploring avenues for the work of the Church. "The bishops' role is the calm enabling of the theological dialogue" (p. 252). Here again we see the bishop placed in a "bridge" relationship between diverse sections of his flock. Prof. Macquarrie's considered opinion is that there needs to be developed the process of "co-theologising," the doing of theology together by all elements that constitute the community of prayer and faith.

Bishops have a special responsibility for getting such thinking going, for they know the needs and mood of the Church and must enable and guide the dialogue. Theologians have their responsibility of bringing the treasures of their learning out of the study to the service of the Church. Both bishops and theologians need the wisdom and knowledge of the lay people if their thinking is to make an impact where it is needed. (p. 253)

But is this the bishop's only role in the theological task? What about his traditional role as guardian of the faith, the historic

teaching office which the cathedra symbolized before it became a throne? A Jesuit, John Coventry, wrote the article on "The Bishop as Guardian of the Faith" (pp. 255-61). While recognizing the historical factors that produced episcopacy, he maintains that its emergence was "under the guidance of the Holy Spirit," and that "it marks off certain ministers for life as members of a higher order of ministry, and therefore with a higher degree of responsibility" (p. 255). It is for this reason, Fr. Coventry urges, that the bishop is particularly entrusted with the guardianship of the faith. This does not mean that he has to be a theologian, and Fr. Coventry would concur with Prof. Macquarrie that the bishop has a responsibility to employ and support the professional theologian. But he goes beyond Prof. Macquarrie in insisting that the bishop exercises a conservative function rather than an innovative one in the theological task: "a role of ensuring as far as possible that the new insights and formulation of Christian truth are in continuity with the old and can be recognised as expressions of the same faith" (p. 258). Such conservation is not to be understood as merely protecting a set of words, however. It must recognize that what is to be preserved is faith in the saving activity of God among his people, an activity which will find expression in widely differing historical and cultural patterns. It is a conservatism that seeks to save as much as possible of past and present, not that endeavors to weed out as much as possible for the sake of being able to present to the world concise statements all based upon one system of thought. The result is that Fr. Coventry, too, finally sees the bishop as a bridge between old

and new, one who holds the balance between the gifts of the Spirit poured out in such profusion upon the Church. But the bishop is especially called to be faithful to the task of proclamation, of not letting that which is the kernel of the good news be lost because "the theologians ... have exposed the limitations of all expressions of Christian faith and in the process have induced a loss of nerve" (p. 261). So it is Fr. Coventry's considered opinion that "at the end of the day, in and through the difficulties and limitations, and therefore in all humility, the Church through its pastors will need to speak with a clear voice, as one having authority" (p. 261). And it will be precisely the question of authority which will plague the bishops when they gather for the Lambeth Conference. Fr. Coventry was able to write out of a tradition with a strong sense of episcopal and papal authority, a tradition which recently in Vatican II had more closely identified the episcopate with the magisterium and had emphasized the importance of preaching. The bishops at Lambeth would not deny that they had inherited a duty to guard the faith; what they had to wrestle with was how that faith is to be defined and by whom; what authority do they have as a college; and where does Anglicanism look for its guidelines in matters of re-interpretation and application of traditional doctrines? These questions will rise again when we come to consider the resolutions in detail. Suffice it to say for now that in that closing sentence of his essay, Fr. Coventry put his finger upon one of the causes of the identity crisis in the modern Anglican episcopate.

The final essay in the series is "The Bishop's Consecration and

Vows" (pp. 262-69), by Keith Rayner, the archbishop of Adelaide, South Australia. The first section must be thought of very much as a "considered opinion," since he declares in favor of viewing ordination as a sacrament, a view that would not find acceptance even among all the Anglican bishops, let alone the body of communicants. Further, he would maintain that ordination both ratifies gifts already given by the Spirit and so is a public authorization to use those gifts in a public ministry and itself conveys spiritual gifts which equip the individual for the ministry to which he is being ordained. The archbishop appeals to Lumen Gentium as proof that in the episcopate the sacrament of orders is contained in its fullness and maintains that "there is no doubt as to the historic continuity of the apostolic office by the unbroken succession of episcopal consecration" (p. 264). He does not deny the assertion of the Anglican-Lutheran International Conversations that "the succession of apostolicity through time is guarded and given contemporary expression in and through a wide variety of means, activities, and institutions," but he is quite clear that for Anglicans (and he is unqualified in his statement about them) such historic continuity is to be identified with episcopal succession. To prove that orders convey an indelible character he draws an analogy with baptism.

What may be said is that at ordination, as at baptism, a man is brought into a distinctive relationship both with Christ and his Church, which gives him an abiding status in relation to both. This need not be based on any theory of ontological metamorphosis, but on the irrevocability of the gifts and call of God, which reflects the fidelity of Christ's relationship with his Church. (pp. 264-65)

It would not be difficult to reconcile this with what the Accra document had to say about the "new relation" that is the result of ordination. Difficulty is with the intransigence about the necessity of episcopal consecration as the primary sign of apostolic continuity. The archbishop clearly reflects the mood of the catholic wing of the church in the tradition of Bishops Gore and Kirk. The latter part of the essay divides the consecration vows under five headings and examines them individually: vocation, the faith, the bishop's life, discipline and mission. The questions concerning vocation are designed to emphasize that "God's call is the necessary pre-condition of this vocation" (p. 266). This would agree with the criteria we have examined in the Accra statement. Archbishop Rayner draws the conclusion that although nothing is said about the irrevocable nature of the vocation it must be understood in the light of the text, "No one who puts his hand to the plough and looks back is fit for the kingdom of God," and so reinforces what he said earlier about the indelible nature of ordination. It would be difficult to establish that the text cited has or was intended to have any bearing upon the special ministry at all, and the argument might be better made from the point of view of the bishop as the representative of the faithfulness of Christ. A better scriptural argument might be made (if it needs to be made at all) from the lesson in Acts appointed for the epistle in the consecration service. There Paul, addressing the Ephesian elders, says, "I do not account my life of any value nor as precious to myself, if only I may accomplish my course and the ministry which I received from the Lord Jesus..."

(Acts 20:24). Here, at any rate, an apostolic precedent is made for the attitude of self-abandonment to the special ministry as a result of that call which is the pre-condition to ordination. Concerning the question about the faith, the archbishop supports the view of the bishop as guardian of the faith, and his interpretation of the vows would not be at variance with what was said earlier by Prof. Macquarrie and Fr. Coventry. He expresses an openness to what is involved in doing theology in the modern world, and what he says is a helpful supplement to the two earlier essays.

Guarding the faith means not simply mounting the battlements to defend it; it also requires the sensitive and perceptive unfolding of its implications for living, and it involves finding new ways of expressing the faith when old formularies have lost their cutting edge. (p. 267)

For this reason he speaks approvingly of the question added to the USA Episcopal ordinal: "Will you boldly proclaim and interpret the gospel of Christ, enlightening the minds and stirring up the conscience of your people?" Questions about the bishop's life follow naturally from what has been said about the bishop's faith, since "there is something wrong with the faith that does not find expression in life." Discipline is still an episcopal responsibility, no matter how unpopular it may be. In the modern setting it is now possible to relate in a more pastoral and personal way, a way typified by the early Church, and it provides an opportunity to demonstrate love in action, but love should never be confused with weakness. Finally, the archbishop believes that the traditional ordinals are lacking a sense of mission that is necessary for the contemporary Church. Such a sense of mission needs to involve the

bishop as fellow-servant with the rest of the Church and must include much more than "ordaining, sending, or laying hands upon others." It must place the bishop within a proper relationship to the whole Church, to his people, his clergy, and his fellow bishops with whom he participates in the episcopal college. For this reason he strongly approves of two new questions in the USA rite: "As a chief priest and pastor, will you encourage and support all baptized people in their gifts and ministries, nourish them from the riches of God's grace, pray for them without ceasing, and celebrate with them the sacraments of our redemption?" and "Will you share with your fellow bishops in the government of the whole Church; will you sustain your fellow presbyters and take counsel with them; will you guide and strengthen the deacons and all others who minister in the Church?"

Although the Preparatory Articles have no official standing and represent only the considered opinions of the authors, one should remember that they also represent the opinions of a considerable number of Anglicans. They certainly represent the wide theological spectrum that the Anglican communion has always been able to contain. The authors are primarily native to England and Scotland, but there is a representative from Australia; Bishop Newbigin spent much of his career in the missions of India, and Prof. Macquarrie began his ministry in the Church of Scotland. Fr. Coventry represents the informed, ecumenical stance of Roman Catholicism that maintains an on-going dialogue with Anglican theologians. Considering the articles, then, as representative samples of what many Anglicans are thinking, what major themes or images

concerning the episcopacy keep emerging in spite of the obvious disagreements?

1. The bishop is a participant in a servant ministry. This is clearly enunciated in Bishop Newbigin's essay: "The whole Church learns to be a servant Church through the teaching and example of those who have been called and ordained to be the servants of the servants of God" (p. 242). Prof. Chadwick touches on that theme in the first paragraph of his essay, and Archbishop Rayner concludes his essay with the hope that this aspect of partnership will find its way into more ordinals. Although Fr. Ecclestone never uses the term servant, he refers to the kenosis of Christ and he uses that to define apostolicity. Bishop Moncrieff concludes his essay on the pastoral role of the bishop with a quotation from St. Augustine:

For you I am a bishop, but with you I am a Christian.
The first an office conferred and accepted; the second a grace received... As then I am gladder to be redeemed with you than I am to be set over you I shall, as the Lord commanded, be more completely your servant.
(p. 241)

2. The bishop's apostolate is essentially missionary. Based on the understanding of apostle as one sent (Ecclestone), the bishop's pastoral concern is to extend to those outside the Church (Moncrieff, Newbigin), and he is expected to be involving himself in the fresh application of the gospel to the world's problems (Rayner, Newbigin, Coventry).

3. The bishop is expected to be able to present a theologically informed interpretation of the gospel. This is not to say that the bishop must be a professional theologian (Macquarrie, Coventry), but that

he should be informed about theological and scriptural issues (Macquarrie, Coventry, Rayner) and be prepared to function as an enabler for the doing of theology in his diocese (Macquarrie, Coventry, Rayner).

4. The bishop is to be a focus for and symbol of unity. This has been a primary episcopal function from the beginning (Chadwick), and with the diverse demands upon the Church today (Newbigin) the bishop should be open and accepting of the conflicts in theology, ethics, and social witness without compromising his own viewpoint (Ecclestone, Moncrieff, Newbigin). He is to be a pontifex, a bridge-builder, not only between the faithful and God (Ecclestone), but between those of the faithful who are divided by conscience or commitments (Newbigin, Macquarrie, Coventry).

5. The bishop's pastoral role is one of reconciliation. Following the example of the emptying of Christ that he might fill men with God (Ecclestone), the bishop should by virtue of his call and ordination (Rayner) see that he has been placed in a new relation to both God and the faithful (Rayner, Chadwick). This calls for insight as well as oversight (Ecclestone), so that he may respond in sympathy to human needs and assist his people to respond in like manner to one another (Newbigin).

6. The bishop is called to make a prophetic witness in the world. He is not simply to minister to the Church (Newbigin), but he is to be willing to be present wherever the forces of evil are to be challenged (Ecclestone) and to the best of his ability bring the word of God to bear upon the human condition (Coventry, Rayner).

The Preparatory Articles are almost as interesting for what they do

not stress as for what they do. Little mention is made of the burden of administration, the reason for many complaints about the work of the episcopacy today. Bennett mentions it only to conclude that placing the bishop in a role ^{of} ~~an~~ consult and consent within a synodal government will solve no problems. Moncrieff cites the Eastern pattern of including administration under pastoral care, but he provides no help in suggesting how this can be realized in the Western Church. Yet surely oversight must entail administration if it is to be at all effective. Bishops have complained about the burden of administrative duties at least since the days of Ambrose, but can we realistically expect that the ministry of bishops can be defined sufficiently without paying much more attention to this very task from which they derive the title episkopos?

Nor is much mention made of the bishop's sacerdotal function. Archbishop Rayner discusses the sacramental nature of ordination in some detail and maintains with Vatican II that the episcopate contains the fullness of the sacrament of order, but when he comes to the discussion of the vows taken at consecration he is restricted by the emphasis placed on the bishop as a minister of the word (see pp. 79-80 above). Prof. Chadwick recounts the emergence of the priestly understanding of the episcopal role, but no notice is taken of it after that. In this respect the articles reflect what has been the traditional Anglican position. The bishop has been many things: disciplinarian, preacher, theologian, moral exemplar, prophet, missionary, guarantor of apostolicity; but his status as high priest for the diocese has rarely been taken with much serious-

ness. Even the question now under some discussion in the Roman church as to the wisdom of taking so much of the bishop's time in the ceaseless round of confirmations is never raised.¹⁸ Is this because confirmation (and ordination) is the only way the bishop's priestly image is ever really made evident in the Anglican system? Does this reflect a presbyterian bias at the heart of Anglicanism? The bishop is necessary for the sake of good order, but is his office the source of that order? To all intent and purpose, the bishop as priest as well as administrator was ignored in the preparatory articles.

3b. A Sectional Report of the Lambeth Conference 1978

The bishops at Lambeth were divided into three sections, each section sub-divided into ten to thirteen groups, and to each group was assigned a topic for study and discussion. The groups reported to the sections, and the sections then submitted to the plenary session whatever recommendations they wished to make for action by the entire Conference. The reports of the sections had only the authority of the sections themselves. We will examine here what Section 2 had to say about the ministry of bishops. The section statement is the result of the report of two groups, one on the bishop's function within the Church and the other on the combined topic of training for episcopal ministry and the personal life of the bishop. The two groups were composed of twenty-eight bishops representing fourteen of the twenty-five geographi-

18. K. Rahner, Bishops: Their Status and Function (London, 1964), p. 29

cal areas of the Anglican communion.¹⁹

The first section of the report (pp. 76-77) deals with episcopal authority and synodical government. Authority is defined as coming from God to the Church as a whole, and the bishop derives his authority from Christ, the Head of the Church, and from the members of the Church who comprise the Body of Christ. The bishop's authority comes from both, "neither without the other." His authority is only to be exercised as a part of the Church and must involve both collegial consultation with the rest of the bishops and the "support and consent of the rest of the Church as far as possible." It is noted that "this authority cannot be evident in its fullness as long as the Church is divided." If the bishop "is the sign and agent of unity and continuity" then that sign is weakened where the life of the community witnesses more to division than unity. We are also told that "the bishop does not receive his authority by any succession independent of the Church." That is surely in keeping with the recent opinions of theologians about apostolic succession, but one must not forget also that this particular Lambeth Conference was working under the pressure being applied by the advocates of women's ordination and the counter-pressure of those who were opposed to it. They were meeting within a year after the admission of women to the priesthood in the United States had been the occasion for the formation of a schismatic church that had consecrated bishops by the use of men within the House of Bishops of the American Episcopal Church. The schismatic

¹⁹. The text of the report with the list of participating bishops and their section assignments is published in The Report of the Lambeth Conference 1978 (London, 1978).

group had operated on the tradition that three bishops are sufficient to create a fourth without any reference to the fact that the three bishops were originally intended to represent the concurrence of the whole episcopate. This statement may be read in the light of the developments in the United States, and if so, would constitute a censure of the bishops who had participated in the new consecrations and would cast grave doubts upon the "validity" of the new bishops.

Five different forms of authority are isolated as being those used by the bishop. No comment is made about them; they are simply listed: (1) the authority of (a) Holy Scripture and (b) tradition; (2) moral authority; (3) the authority of the office; (4) the authority of counsel by scholars and experts; and (5) the law of the Church. If it was the intention of the section to list the authorities in terms of the gravitas inherent in them, it is interesting to note that moral (personal?) authority precedes that of office, and that the law of the Church takes last place. This could mean that the Anglicans have taken the contemporary "crisis of authority" much more seriously than did Vatican II, possibly because of the advantage of their point in history. Regardless of the form ^memployed, it must be "always exercised as by a servant in love, humility, and self-abandonment." The difficulties in the American church may have led to the following qualification which immediately follows that statement:

It must however be recognized that there may be cases of defiance of canonical regulations which are so serious and so disruptive of the peace and fellowship of the Christian community that, when all other means have failed, recourse must be made to the machinery provided by canon law for the resolving of the issues. (p. 76)

It would appear that the bishops could not avoid the fact that authority without power may often be of little use.

The bishop's exercise of authority in the diocese finds expression "in the missionary pastoral situations, liturgical and teaching activities, and through his leadership and participation in the synods and councils of the Church." His function as a guardian of the faith is related to membership in the episcopal college, thus it is important that he participate regularly in such meetings as the Lambeth Conference and in other episcopal consultations.

Although this first part of the report is entitled "Episcopal Authority and Synodical Government," it is concerned almost exclusively with episcopal authority. We are told that synodical government must "make provision" for seeing that the bishop's responsibility as a collegial guardian of the faith should be fulfilled. What this may involve other than paying his travel expenses to Canterbury is not made clear. The only other mention of synodical government is the following sentence:

Anglicanism has firmly committed itself to constitutional episcopacy in which the government of the Church by the bishop is limited and supported by synods, canons, and other methods whereby the whole Church - clergy and laity - participate in its government and mission. (p. 77)

This suggests three things: (1) it is the bishop who governs; (2) his government is limited and supported by a constitution which defines the legitimate exercise of power; and (3) the clergy and laity have a clear voice in determining those limits and supports. The degree to

which the authority and power of the bishop can be limited without compromising his episcopal identity is not made explicit. Could the constitution separate the authority to ordain from the power to ordain? Episcopal bishops in the United States have the right on the basis of conscience not to ordain women, even though the constitution and canons now permit it. It is not impossible to conceive of a constitution which would delegate the examination of candidates to a group of clergy and laity and then require the bishop to ordain those so recommended. Does the bishop become something less than a bishop in that case?

The second section of the report (pp. 77-78) deals with "The Bishop's Function in the Church." "The bishop is primarily a father in God to his diocese" and his ministry should therefore be exercised with the concern that the head of a family has for each member of it. The report affirms the sacramental character of ordination and places it "within the fellowship of the Church," thus underscoring the earlier statement that there is no succession independent of the Church. Nothing is said about succession to the apostles. The succession is "to Christ the original Apostle," and it is as his representative that the bishop is able to ordain to the ministry of the Church. Admission to the order is through the laying on of hands by other bishops, but there is no attempt to describe the process by which the succession "succeeds."

Five functions are identified: ordaining, preaching, teaching, pastoral oversight, and public pronouncements (prophetic witness). Preaching is the "primary function." The report agrees with Lumen Gentium when it says that the bishop represents his diocese in his meetings with

the college of bishops, and he represents the universal episcopate before his own people. He "is at once the focus and symbol of the catholicity of the Church." It is interesting to note how the major agreements we isolated in the preparatory articles (pp. 204-05) are reflected here. The section prefers the image of father to servant, and it ignores any concept of mission, but the insistence upon the symbolic role of the unity of the Church, the importance of preaching and teaching, the need for a pastoral spirit, and the assumption of an involvement in the world that will allow the bishop to give prophetic direction, all correlate with the images reflected by the earlier authors. [REDACTED]. Nothing is said about his relation to the administrative tasks (except that he should not proceed "in a bureaucratic way"), and his role as the source of the diocesan liturgical life is ignored. Although the term is never used, one might say that the image of shepherd rather than priest is more congenial to the Anglican bishop; it is certainly the image reinforced by the lessons of the traditional consecration rite.

The third section of the report (pp. 78-79), one which found acceptance as a resolution in the plenary, has to do with the training of bishops. The resolution simply asks that training before assuming office and continuing education be supplied, but the section report is rather more detailed. And here the administrative concerns are by no means slighted. The report first acknowledges that training can never be a substitute for vocation, and that the bishop's life needs "to be ever open to the guiding and transforming activity of the Holy Spirit."

Training and education, the acquisition of skills, are all seen as means offered by the Spirit for use in the growth and nurture of the bishop. The specific recommendations are that guidelines be prepared within the particular circumstances of each national Church that will detail what a bishop needs to learn and how to apply what he learns.

A suggested table of contents for such a manual is supplied:

- a. Clarification of the episcopal office
 - 1. the office of bishop in the Church of God
 - 2. the role and function of the bishop in the Church
- b. Personal growth and life-style
 - 1. maintaining vital dependence on God
(prayer, study, meditation);
 - 2. spiritual growth and development in the face of
new situations and changing value systems;
 - 3. development of support systems - family, friends,
peers, community;
 - 4. time management for re-creation and care of family,
friends, personal health;
 - 5. continuing education
- c. Operational skills
 - 1. Liturgical
 - 2. Administrative
 - organizational
 - personnel
 - financial
 - legal
 - 3. Role fulfilment
 - goal setting
 - team building
 - accountability
 - evaluation (pp. 78-79)

The influence of contemporary management techniques is obvious here, and it is not within the scope of this thesis to analyze their relevance. What is important to note is that however little administration is found deserving attention in theoretical discussions of the work of a bishop, when the bishops began to deal with the actual demands placed upon them they gave major consideration to the task. It should also be noted that while the priestly functions were largely ignored by the preparatory

articles and those who dealt with the function of bishops, the bishops discussing the areas in which training is essential listed liturgical expertise as the first of the needed operational skills.

The question we must ask is whether or not the suggestions for training were developed in light of what the bishops thought the ministry of a bishop ought to be, or as a result of their own experience of what a bishop has had to do in the past and will still be expected to do in the immediate future. How do these guidelines prepare a bishop to approach the prophetic vocation which was emphasized in the preparatory articles, in the section report, and will be incorporated into the plenary resolutions? How is the bishop prepared to move from the limited scope of a parish to the shepherding of a diocese? What provision is made for expanding his horizons to include the wider mission of the Church? If the guidelines are met, will they produce anything more than a modern Western-style corporation executive in a cassock?

Because the report recognizes the impossibility of separating "a bishop's public office from his private and domestic life," it isolates four areas that "need careful attention" in order to safeguard the integrity of the bishop as a whole person:

1. Integration of knowledge and contemplation. That his intellectual and devotional life are so developed that he is able to make meaning of crisis, be critically conscious of social injustice, and make intellectual sense out of seemingly disparate circumstances. Adequate attention to physical and emotional health must also be considered.
2. Intimate family integration (or, if single, its equivalent). A sound home situation to rely on for support, and deep mutual sharing in an atmosphere of personal trust.

3. Team integration. A good 'give and take' working group in which the bishop can participate effectively as member and leader, and which provides him with adult-to-adult interaction.

4. Integration with equals. Solid group support from other executive leaders (not necessarily episcopal) with whom he can share the concerns of work and family.

The voice of the baptized sociologist and human relations consultant is easily detected here. To say that is not to scoff at their techniques or their employment by the Church, but it does mean that we must beware of the humanistic presuppositions often underlying their methods which are devoted to a success mentality. Does "make meaning of crisis" refer in any sense to crucifixion and resurrection or, in Pauline terms, to becoming "a laughing stock?" Is it possible to translate "be critically conscious of social injustice, and make intellectual sense out of seemingly disparate circumstances" as learning to live with inherited episcopal prerogatives in an age for which they are unsuited at best and at worst reflect an attitude of indifference to the needs of humanity? The second point is good in that it admits that the forces of disintegration which afflict so many Western families have not left clerical households immune. But is there at its root the corporation mentality that insists that the wife is as important to the company as her husband and forces her to be involved in its life for his success' sake? What does this do to those wives who are willing to support but not share the husband's vocation? (And, no doubt, the Roman bishops would like to know what the single equivalent is.) Why is "team integration" not a part of the training in team building that is included under operational skills?

The fourth point carries an implication that is difficult to reconcile with the servant image that has been so much discussed. One is reminded of Mr. Howat's bishop in the preparatory article "whose administrative competence, business acumen and personal status allow him to move with ease in the ranks of men and women who lead and govern in secular walks of life." And the same criticism applies. This is not to say that the bishop has no need to "share the concerns of work and family," but one wonders if it is necessary to do that in such an insulated fashion. And finally, it might be asked whether or not these four areas of concern should not extend to all clerical families and individuals. Should they not be so basic to clerical training and formation that they are already a part of his baggage when he moves into the episcopal residence?

3c. The Ministry of Bishops in the Official Resolutions

The Lambeth bishops approved thirty-seven resolutions. Eight of them relate in some manner to episcopal ministry, and it is those we shall now examine.

Resolution 9 was on stewardship. Part 2 says

In the opinion of the Conference, the scriptural injunction 'he who would be chief among you, let him be the servant of all' requires bishops to reject pretentious life-styles and by example to lead their clergy and people in the wise use of their personal resources and also those of the Church. (pp. 40-41)

This is the first time bishops are mentioned in the resolutions, and three points may be noted immediately. First, bishops are the leaders

in the Church; they are "chief," otherwise the text cited would have no meaning. Secondly, the role of servant is the form by which their ministry is to be understood and exercised. Third, part of their ministry is that of moral exemplar - in this case providing an example in the life-style one adopts and in the proper use of resources.

Resolution 11 reflects the dual concern that was present throughout the Conference: the repercussions from the ordination of women and the concern to find a locus of authority within the Anglican communion. It says

The Conference advises member Churches not to take action regarding issues which are of concern to the whole Anglican communion without consultation with a Lambeth Conference or with the episcopate through the Primates Committee, and requests the primates to initiate a study of the nature of authority within the Anglican communion. (p. 41)

We saw that Section 2 dealt at length with the nature and source of episcopal authority, but that was primarily at the diocesan level. What happens when a bishop exercises his authority within his diocese in such a manner as to offend or alienate other bishops or a large section of the Church? With its historic devotion to a Cyprianic theory of episcopacy, that is a question the Anglican Church has never satisfactorily answered. How do the bishops as a college instruct and discipline one another? As long as there was general agreement not to offend against the Vincentian canon of maintaining what has been done in all times and in all places by all the faithful, and as long as historical research did not illustrate just how diverse practice has been, a kind of harmo-

ny could be maintained without recourse to a central authority such as the pope or a synod of bishops. That now seems to be impossible. The threat of schism, realized in the United States and a possibility in England, was a shadow over the Conference, and obviously a large number of bishops felt that one way of dispelling it was to provide the Communion with a means of dealing with such issues as the ordination of women. The Archbishop of Canterbury addressed the Conference on the subject of authority within the Communion, but he provided little help in the way of advocating any kind of centralization. He thought there should be a Doctrinal Commission, but it should only be advisory. His advice was that there should be periodic meetings of the primates for discussion, and that the work of the primates should be related to the Anglican Consultative Council, and that there should be appointed a Communications Officer. The archbishop described the present situation as one of "creative tension," but believed that if his suggestions were followed the Communion "should move towards a maturity in the exercise of authority" (pp. 122-24). The bishops clearly felt that the attitudes towards authority which have maintained the Anglican ethos and consensus are no longer sufficient, but there appears to be no voice to give them direction for the future. This new crisis of authority (where is it to be found?) will surely contribute to the identity crisis of the Anglican bishop in the last decades of the twentieth century.

Resolution 13 (p. 42) is a continuation of the authority problem. It reaffirms the need for consultation by the entire episcopate "in

order that the guardianship of the faith may be exercised as a collegial responsibility," and recommends that the Archbishop of Canterbury in consultation with other primates call such meetings. The question of authority enters here precisely because the Lambeth Conference has no authority except that of the individual bishops who compose the majority that pass the resolutions. Its decisions are not binding upon the bishops or their dioceses unless the individual churches act to accept them. The bishops see that they have responsibility as guardians of the faith, but they do not see any clear pattern by which to establish what the faith is for the modern world. Of course, this is not so different from the situation in which Cyprian lived, and one must ask whether to depend upon moral authority alone with all its difficulties is still better than to surrender episcopal independence to a centralized magisterium. The Anglican bishops do have the opportunity now to confess their faith in the guidance of the Spirit rather than in legal systems. Is a search for external structures of authority an act of "bad faith?"

The 17th Resolution (p. 44), dealing with new dioceses, calls for the provision of an adequate stipend for the bishop. This is obviously a practical matter, but it is practical precisely because of the recognition of the importance of having a bishop on the scene. He is not to follow the missionary activity of presbyters, but he is to be there involved in the work from the beginning. It is the bishop who represents the fullness of the Church; his presence can less be dispensed with than any of the other workers.

The 18th Resolution (p. 44) concerns the public ministry of the bishop. It reflects that portion of the discussion of Section 2 which we examined above (pp. 211-12) and which the bishops desired to affirm. The Resolution does not follow the Section's lead and speak of the bishop in succession "to Christ the original Apostle." Instead, "the Conference affirms that a bishop is called to be one with the apostles ...". The identity, however, is not in terms of succession, but identity in proclamation of the apostolic witness which is defined as (1) proclaiming Christ's resurrection, (2) interpreting the Gospel, and (3) testifying to Christ's sovereignty. He is also to reflect the ministry of the prophets by being concerned for the well-being of the whole community, especially of those at a disadvantage. His ministry is not just to or for the Church. He is to express publicly his concern for issues which involve justice, mercy, and truth. And the members of the Church are called upon to support the bishop in his exercise of this ministry. Once again, the emphasis is upon the ministry of preaching, and as nothing was said of the sacramental character of the bishop in the Section, so nothing was said in the plenary Resolution.

The plenary session agreed with the Section on the need for training and continuing education. The 19th Resolution (p. 44) requests that this be implemented by each Church, but it is not clear if the exact guidelines outlined by the Section are to be employed.

Resolutions 21 and 22 (pp. 45-47), on the ordination of women, are the setting for three statements about the ministry of bishops. The

Conference acknowledged the "distress and pain" which had been caused to those on both sides of the issue and declared that "to heal these and to maintain and strengthen fellowship is a primary pastoral responsibility of all, and especially of bishops." It is therefore important to "ensure that all baptized members of the Church continue to be in communion with their bishop." And, having seen the problems created by ordination of women to the presbyterate, the bishops were anxious to avoid another crisis by the consecration of a woman to the episcopate. They did not officially disapprove of such, but recommended that such action not be taken "without consultation with the episcopate through the primates and overwhelming support in any member Church and in the diocese concerned, lest the bishop's office should become a cause of disunity instead of a focus of unity"(underlining mine).

It would appear, then, that the controversy surrounding the ordination of women brought the bishops face to face with two major issues. The first was the question of authority. By what authority does a bishop or a member Church in the Anglican Communion break with the inherited tradition? And if such a rupture does occur, the second issue is how the episcopacy is able to maintain itself as a sign of unity. Or put in another way, how is it possible to contain within the same office the roles of prophet and minister of reconciliation? The answer the bishops appear to have given is that the unifying role is the more important, and the prophet must take a back seat to the stabilizer. The entire point of the Lambeth Conference seems to have been to hold the Anglican Communion together by emphasizing how much greater a sin

is disunity than the deprivation of the rights of individuals within the Church. That, at least, from the point of view of those bishops who would ordain women. But even for those who would not, the maintaining of the house in good repair seemed to be more important than those theological issues on which they had based their opposition.

The Lambeth Conference was convened with the assertion that a major item on the agenda would be the ministry of bishops. We have examined the preparatory articles, and we have seen the results produced by the Section assigned to consider the topic. Now, on the basis of what was said in the official Resolutions alone, what did the Lambeth Conference finally say about bishops and their ministry?

1. The bishop is one with the apostles
in proclaiming Christ's resurrection
in interpreting the Gospel
in testifying to Christ's sovereignty.
2. The bishop participates in the ministry of the prophets
in his concern for the whole community's welfare
in his public involvement in issues of justice, mercy,
and truth.
He should expect the support of his people in this ministry.
3. The bishop is to be the leader in the Christian community,
but he is to be among his people as one who serves.
4. The bishop has an obligation of setting an example to his people.
5. With the other bishops he has the responsibility for the
guardianship of the faith.
6. The bishop is to be a focus of unity, entailing that
all the baptized should remain in communion with him, and
that he is responsible for the pastoral role of healing di-
visions and maintaining and strengthening the
fellowship of the Church.

We now turn to see how these theological principles from these three sources have been reflected in five recent consecration rites.

CHAPTER FOUR: AN EXAMINATION OF FIVE RECENT
EPISCOPAL CONSECRATION RITES

We will now examine in detail five recent consecration rites for bishops to see what they tell us in text and rubric about episcopal ministry as far as each denomination is concerned. Each rite will be printed with annotations below it. At the end of each rite will be a discussion of its implications for the doctrine of episcopacy. The annotations will refer usually to historical and liturgical matters; the concluding essay will be in more general terms. The scripture lessons appointed for the rites will be discussed as a group in a sixth essay at the end of the chapter.

The five rites selected for consideration are representative of certain theological and/or liturgical trends in those communions which have recently engaged in the revision of their ordinals. The earliest rite is that of the Church of South India, one of the first fruits of the liturgical and ecumenical movements. Next is the new Roman Pontifical, the result of the discussions about episcopacy and liturgical reform that took place at the Second Vatican Council. The third rite is that of a non-existent denomination, the Church of Christ Uniting. COCU is the proposed merger of ten denominations in the United States, and as a part of their preparatory discussions they issued a statement on ministry and a proposed ordinal. It will be instructive to compare this with the earlier CSI work to see what changes might have occurred on the ecumenical scene in thinking about episcopacy and how this change is reflected in the proposed rite. The last two rites to be considered will be those of

the Episcopal Church in the United States and the Church of England. Although these are both churches in the Anglican communion, they reflect two different approaches to the meaning of episcopacy and two different trends in liturgical use. Almost any change in other future Anglican ordinals will follow one or the other of these patterns, and therefore both need to be considered.

The following abbreviations will be used when referring to the different rites:

CE - Church of England

COCU - Church of Christ Uniting (U.S.A.)

CSI - Church of South India

ECUSA - Episcopal Church in the United States of America

RP - Roman Pontifical

THE CONSECRATION OF BISHOPS
according to the Ordinal of
The Church of South India*

THE PREFACE TO THE ORDINAL¹

'The Church of South India believes that the ministry is a gift of God through Christ to His Church, which He has given for the perfecting of the life and service of all its members' (Constitution II. 7). The Church as a whole is a priestly body, since it is the body of Christ the great High Priest. All its members, according to the measure of the gift of Christ, share in its priestly nature. Yet from the beginning God has entrusted particular ministries to particular persons within it, and these have, through the Church, received the commission of Christ.² The ordained ministry of the Church of South

*The text reproduced here is that of The Book of Common Worship as Authorised by the Synod 1962 (London, 1963), pp. 160-61, 173-79.

1. Ordinal prefaces are a characteristic of Anglicanism and those ecumenical groups influenced by it. The earliest is that of 1549. Its major assertions are five: (1) that the orders of bishop, priest, and deacon are apostolic in their roots and have always been reverently esteemed; (2) that there are proper ages for the conferring of orders; (3) that there are proper times and places for ordination; (4) that the candidates shall be duly tested as to character and qualifications; and (5) that there are indispensable rites and ceremonies ministered by a bishop for ordination - public prayer with imposition of hands.

2. Cranmer's Ordinal begins: "It is evident unto all men diligently reading holy Scripture and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons." It is interesting to note how the Anglican influence demands that that assertion be re-expressed in some way in each of the Ordinals we are examining (except, of course, the Roman). The re-expression is compromised, however, by the last two sentences of this paragraph. Could CSI have chosen other "particular ministries" than bishops, priests, and deacons as its ordained ministry? If the ministry

India consists of Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons. In accepting this ministry the Church of South India desires to maintain continuity with the historic ministry of the Church as it has come down to us from early times through the uniting Churches.

An ordination service is the rite by which one of these ministries is conferred. It is an act of God in his Church. 'The Church of South India believes that in all ordinations and consecrations the true Ordainer and Consecrator is God, who, in response to the prayers of His Church, and through the words and acts of its representatives, commissions and empowers for the office and work to which they are called the persons whom it has selected' (Constitution II.11; see also II.7).

In the earliest ordination of which we have record, that described in Acts 6:1-6, the following parts appear: election by the people, prayer, and the laying on of apostolic hands.³ In accordance with this pattern, which is the scriptural authority for what is said in the Constitution (IV.25 and V.5) of the essential elements in ordination services, the same three parts form the basis of the services in this book:

(1) the presentation of the candidates to the presiding Bishop, this being the last step in the process of choice of them by the Church;

(2) prayer for those about to be ordained or consecrated, that they may receive the gift of the Holy Spirit for their ministry; and

(3) the laying on of hands of at least three Bishops (in an episcopal consecration), of the Bishop and Presbyters (in an ordination of Presbyters), or of the Bishop (in an ordination of Deacons).

comes through "the uniting Churches" and not simply one of those churches, does this mean that the previous ministry of all of them had equal "validity?"

3. These three parts differ from those described in the Accra statement (epiclesis, sign, acknowledgement) by including the presentation and by not specifying acknowledgement as such. It might be argued that acknowledgement occurs in the declaration to the people, their response at the end of the rite, and their participation with the new bishop in the Eucharist which follows.

To these have been added an examination of the candidates concerning their beliefs and duties, the delivery to them of the instruments of their office (Bible, pastoral staff), and the giving of the right hand of fellowship.⁴ These ceremonies, however valuable for their symbolism, are not essential elements in the rites of ordination.

THE CONSECRATION OF BISHOPS

The service begins with the first part of The Order for the Lord's Supper, called The Preparation.⁵

THE PRESENTATION OF THE BISHOP-ELECT

The Bishop-elect is presented to the Moderator or his deputy by three presbyters⁶ of the Diocese to which he is appointed, and one of the presbyters says:

Reverend Father in God, we present unto you this godly and well-learned man to be consecrated Bishop.⁷

4. The giving of the right hand of fellowship is based on the acceptance of Paul and Barnabas as missionaries by the apostles at Jerusalem (Gal. 2:9). A popular rite in many Protestant churches, it has tended to take the place of the kiss of peace. In its Galatian context it is not so much an authorization or commissioning as a recognition by the other apostles of the fact that Paul had already "been entrusted with the gospel to the uncircumcised."

5. This includes the entry of the ministers and the Bible, the Collect for Purity, the Gloria in Excelsis or other hymn, and an act of confession with comfortable words and absolution.

6. The lack of lay presenters is silent witness to the fact that this is the earliest of the rites under examination. But one should appreciate the change to presbyteral presentation from the BCP usage where it is done by other bishops.

7. From BCP.

The Moderator says:

Let the instrument of his election and appointment be read.⁸

The Secretary of the Synod, or some other duly appointed person, reads the instrument.

The Moderator says to the people:

Beloved, this is he whom we intend, God willing, this day to consecrate Bishop. You have heard that he has been duly elected and appointed, and that the appointment has been confirmed by those who have authority to do so. We therefore ask you to declare your assent.

The people stand, and the Moderator says:

We are not sufficient of ourselves; our sufficiency is from God.⁹

Do you trust that he is, by God's grace, worthy to be consecrated?

The people say: We trust that he is worthy. To God be the glory.

THE MINISTRY OF THE WORD OF GOD

The Moderator says: The Lord be with you:

People: And with thy spirit.

The Moderator: Let us pray.

The people kneel.

The Moderator: Almighty God, Giver of all good things, who by thy one Spirit hast appointed a diversity of ministration in thy Church: Mercifully behold this thy servant now called to the office of Bishop; and so replenish him with the truth of thy gospel, adorn him with innocency of life, and fill him with the power of thy Holy Spirit, that, both by word and good example, he may faithfully and joyfully serve thee to the glory of thy name and the building up of thy Church; through the merits of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who liveth and reigneth with thee and the

8. This is based on the older customs of the reading of the Royal Mandate (BCP) and before that the papal bull authorizing consecration, both of which are retained in CE and RP.

9. II Cor. 3:5. The appropriateness of this passage is more evident when we remember that Paul is here discussing his apostleship which is seen as being dependent upon the Spirit.

Holy Spirit, one God, world without end.¹⁰

The people: Amen.

The lesson from the Old Testament: Ezekiel 34:11-16¹¹

Psalm 119:105-112 or a hymn

The Epistle: Acts 20:28-35¹²

The Gospel: John 20:19-23

The Sermon

The Nicene Creed

Hymn

THE EXAMINATION OF THE BISHOP-ELECT

The Bishop-elect stands before the Moderator, who sits.

The Moderator says:

In the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, the King and Head of the Church, who being ascended on high, has given gifts unto men for the building up of his Body,¹³ we are met here to consecrate you Bishop in the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, by prayer and the laying on of hands.¹⁴

In this act of consecration we believe that it is God who gives you grace and authority for the office and work to which you are called, and that he does so in answer to the prayers of his Church and through the actions and words of his appointed ministers. We act and speak as part

10. This prayer is based upon the one appointed to conclude the litany in the 1661 BCP consecration rite. Three changes should be noted: (1) "the office of Bishop" for "the work and ministry of a Bishop"; (2) "the truth of thy gospel" for "the truth of thy doctrine"; and (3) the inclusion of "and fill him with the power of thy Holy Spirit."

11. See Section 6 of this chapter for commentary on the lections.

12. This passage is so chosen that it avoids the fact that Luke uses both presbyteroi and episkopoi interchangeably in the larger context (from v. 17).

13. Eph. 4:8, 12

14. This is a statement of intent designed to meet possible Catholic objections.

of the universal Church, and in the faith which we have now with united voice declared in the words of the Creed.¹⁵

Wherefore, that we may know that you indeed profess this faith, and desire by God's grace to fulfil this ministry, we require of you to answer these questions:

Do you trust that you are called to the office of Bishop in the Church of God?¹⁶

Answer: I do.

Are zeal for the glory of God, love for our Lord Jesus Christ, and a desire for the salvation of men, so far as you know your own heart, your chief motives for accepting this office?¹⁷

Answer: So far as I know my own heart, they are.

Do you accept the Holy Scriptures as containing all things necessary for salvation, and as the supreme and decisive standard of faith?¹⁸

Answer: I do.

Do you accept the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds as witnessing to and safeguarding the faith which is set forth in Scripture?¹⁹

15. It should be observed that the Creed takes a significant place in all the rites we will be examining, except the Roman. The obvious intent is that adherence to the Creed is a sign of the bishop's function as proclaimer and guardian of the faith.

16. Nothing is said about the source of the call, whether from God or the Church, or God through the Church. Cf. the source of this question in the BCP: "Are you persuaded that you be truly called to this Ministration, according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the order of this Realm?" Notice should be taken of how this question is put in the other rites in order to attain more clarification. RP has no equivalent question.

17. This question is unique in that it questions motivation.

18. Cf. BCP: "Are you persuaded that the holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all doctrine, required of necessity to eternal salvation through faith in Jesus Christ?"

19. See Note 15.

Answer: I do.

Will you be diligent in the study of the Holy Scriptures, praying for a true understanding of them, that you may be able to feed your people with the Bread of life, to lead them in accordance with God's will, and to withstand and convince false teachers?²⁰

Answer: I will, God being my helper.

Will you faithfully administer discipline in accordance with God's word and the order of this Church?²¹

Answer: I will, God being my helper.

Will you be a faithful witness of Christ to those among whom you live, and lead your people to obey our Saviour's command to make disciples of all nations?²²

Answer: I will, God being my helper.

Will you do all in your power to ensure that the worship offered by the ministers and people committed to your charge shall be worthy of God's majesty and love?²³

Answer: I will, God being my helper.

Will you seek always the unity and peace of this Church and of the whole Church of God?²⁴

20. This is a fresh rendering of the BCP source.

21. This is from a larger question in the BCP source that has been divided into two for this rite. See Appendix D for BCP sources.

22. There is no equivalent for this in the BCP source. It reflects the missionary character and origins of CSI.

23. Only this and the COCU rite, which is largely derivative from CSI, emphasizes so explicitly the episcopal function of oversight of worship. One might ask what human worship is ever "worthy of God's majesty and love."

24. This is a radical alteration of the BCP source: "Will you maintain ... quietness, love, and peace among all men...?" It may reflect the attitude of the Church apart from the world that missionary situations may engender. Or, more positively, it may be the result of the ecumenical spirit that produced CSI.

Answer: I will, God being my helper.

Will you order your own life, and that of your household, in accordance with God's holy laws, that you may be an example to your people?²⁵

Answer: I will, God being my helper.

Will you for Christ's sake be gentle and merciful to the poor and needy?²⁶

Answer: I will, God being my helper.

Will you see that Baptism and Confirmation are duly and regularly administered in your diocese, and will you be faithful and discreet in ordaining men to the sacred ministry?²⁷

Answer: I will, God being my helper.

Seeing you believe you are called to exercise this ministry within the Church of South India, do you promise to fulfil the duties of your office in accordance with the constitution of this Church and of the diocese to which you are appointed?²⁸

Answer: I do, by the help of God.

All kneel, and the Moderator says:

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who has given you the will to do all these things, grant you also grace to perform them. Faithful is he that

25. Based on BCP, but "that of your household" reflects I Tim. 3:4 and is an addition.

26. The bishop's ministry to the poor and needy has been continually recognized in Western ordination examinations. This emphasis may also help to explain why the deacon, who is ordinarily associated with such ministry, has been understood to be the bishop's assistant rather than the presbyter's. Justin described the president of the assembly as "the curate of all who are in need" (I Apology).

27. The reference to ordaining is based on the 1661 BCP source. The references to baptism and confirmation unite the initiatory rites of the Church as being under the supervision of the bishop, and they also compensate the Anglican tradition for the fact that in CSI the bishop is no longer the unique minister of confirmation.

28. This question takes the place of the oath of allegiance in CE.

calleth you, who also will do it.²⁹

The people: Amen.

THE CONSECRATION

The Moderator calls the people to silent prayer.

The hymn 'Come, Holy Ghost' is sung kneeling.³⁰

The Moderator, standing together with the Bishops (and Presbyters),³¹

29. The first sentence is adapted from the first sentence in the BCP source equivalent. This substitutes "grace" for "strength and power." The second sentence is from I Thess. 5:24.

30. Since 1549 the Veni Creator Spiritus has come to be considered almost part of the required form for ordinations in the Anglican communion and those influenced by it. Cranmer moved it from its place in the Roman rite, where it was sung mid-way through the consecratory prayer, to an introductory position for the consecration. As we will see in the other rites, the recent tendency has been to make it a much less privileged part of the service. Canon Cuming, in defending the new CE rite before the General Synod, said,

"The Veni creator we have tried in three different places ... first of all as a gradual, secondly as an introduction to the ordination part of the service, and thirdly, back in its own place. There is a slight danger of it becoming accepted in the Church of England as part of the form of ordination, which it never has been, and so, just to safeguard against this, we have followed the 1662 practice of not including it in the deacon's service. It was only the Anglican/Methodist Ordinal which extended it to the three services. I think that the Veni creator is rather like the Prayer of Humble Access in one respect, of which Dom Gregory Dix said that Cranmer must have composed it on a lovely summer afternoon and since then nobody has known just where to put it. It is the same with the Veni creator: it is a lovely formula, but there is always a problem to know where in the service it ought to go."

(Report of Proceedings, VIII.2, July, 1977)

31. Although the Preface decreed the employment of three bishops in an episcopal consecration, the rubrics here permit the use of presbyters in the imposition of hands. The implications for clearly separating the episcopate into a third and higher order containing the fullness of

says:

We glorify thee, O God, most merciful Father, that of thine infinite love and goodness towards us thou didst choose a people for thine own possession to be a royal priesthood and a holy nation,³² and hast given thine only Son Jesus Christ to be our great High Priest³³ and the Author of eternal salvation.³⁴ We thank thee that by his death he has overcome death and, having ascended into heaven, has poured forth his gifts abundantly upon thy people, making some apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors and teachers, for the building up of his Body the Church,³⁵ until his coming again in glory; and, we humbly beseech thee,³⁶ Here the Moderator and the Bishops (and Presbyters) lay their hands upon the head of the Bishop-elect; and the Moderator repeats the following words:

SEND DOWN THY HOLY SPIRIT UPON THY SERVANT ..., WHOM WE, IN THY NAME, AND IN OBEDIENCE TO THY MOST BLESSED WILL, DO NOW ORDAIN AND CONSECRATE BISHOP IN THY CHURCH.³⁷

The people say: Amen.

And the Moderator continues:

Give him grace, we beseech thee, to be a faithful ambassador of Christ to the world, to offer with all thy people spiritual sacrifices

priesthood in the sense of Vatican II are evident. CSI intentionally keeps the distinction vague and undefined.

32. I Peter 2:9

33. Heb. 4:14

34. Heb. 5:9 (KJV)

35. Eph. 4:9-12

36. This first part of the prayer is modelled largely upon the BCP source.

37. The BCP imperative form, "Receive the Holy Spirit," is discarded in favor of the precatory epiclesis, the same form employed by all the later rites as well as the Hippolytean consecration. Both terms, "ordain and consecrate," are used to describe the activity of the Spirit. This appears to be a compromise about the nature of the order (office) bestowed.

acceptable to thee, to feed and govern thy flock as a true shepherd, and to promote love and unity among all people. Deliver him from all the assaults of the devil, and grant that in all things he may fulfil his ministry without reproach in thy sight, and, abiding steadfast to the end, may be received with all thy faithful servants into thine eternal glory; through Jesus Christ our Lord, who liveth and reigneth, and is worshipped and glorified, with thee, O Father, and the Holy Spirit, one God, world without end.³⁸

People: Amen.

THE PRESENTATION OF THE BIBLE AND PASTORAL STAFF

The Moderator delivers to him a copy of the Bible, saying:

Take this, a token of the authority which you have received to be a Bishop in the Church of God. Give heed unto reading, exhortation, and teaching. Think upon the things contained in this book. Give yourself wholly to them, that the increase coming thereby may be manifest unto all men; for by so doing you shall save both yourself and those who hear you.³⁹

The Moderator gives him the right hand of fellowship⁴⁰ and says:

We give you the right hand of fellowship, and receive you to take part with us in this ministry.

38. This is a radical revision of the remainder of the BCP source. "Spiritual sacrifices" may be considered to emphasize something of the episcopal high priestly function, but that is not its intent in the NT source (I Pet. 4:5). The "love and peace among all men," which was lost in the Examination (see Note 24) finds a place here as "love and unity among all people."

39. Except for the first sentence, this is taken from the BCP source. How the Bible is a token of episcopal authority is not clear since it is also delivered to deacons and presbyters at their ordinations.

40. See Note 3. It is not clear to whom "us" refers. Is this reception into the episcopal college or, if the attending presbyters are included, into the diocese?

The Moderator delivers to him the Pastoral Staff,⁴¹ saying:

Be to the flock of Christ a good shepherd. Feed the flock; hold up the weak, heal the sick, bind up the broken, bring again the out-cast, seek the lost. So be merciful that you be not remiss; so minister discipline, that you forget not mercy: that when the Chief Shepherd shall appear you may receive the never-fading crown of glory.

The Moderator says to the people:

We declare that ... is a Bishop in the Church of God, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.

The people: Amen. Thanks be to God.

A doxology is sung.

The Order for the Lord's Supper continues at the Intercession. The second litany may be used, with the addition of the following petitions after that for our bishops and all other ministers:

For the servant of God now consecrated Bishop, that he may faithfully minister to the glory of his name, let us pray to the Lord.

For the wife and home of him who has been consecrated, that they may show forth the love of Christ, let us pray to the Lord.

Proper Preface:

Through Jesus Christ our Lord, who gave authority to his disciples, saying, 'As the Father hath sent me, even so send I you'.⁴²

41. This restores the original 1549 usage of the delivery of the staff with the intended formula. See Appendix D.

42. John 20:21. This passage emphasizes the pioneer and apostolic nature of Christian ministry, not simply that of the episcopate (even though it is from the Gospel appointed for episcopal consecrations), since it is also to be used as the proper preface at the ordination of presbyters.

The Anglican liturgical influence is strong in the Ordinal of the Church of South India because the Anglicans were the only one of the uniting churches that had an episcopacy, and it was their concept of the threefold order of ministry that was adopted by the emerging church. The use of an explanatory preface to the Ordinal, the phraseology and the prayers, the particular use of the Veni creator, and the formula for the presentation of the Bible and pastoral staff are all an inheritance from the Anglican tradition. All of this is so obvious that one might be tempted to say that CSI simply adopted the Anglican episcopacy. It is necessary to look closely at the preface and the questions of the examination to see the influence of the non-episcopal churches and the fruits of the theological quest for the meaning of episcopacy.

The Preface begins with the affirmation that ministry is a gift of God to the whole Church which is a priestly body because "it is the body of Christ the great High Priest." Thus the priesthood of all believers is maintained while "particular ministries to particular persons" are differentiated within it. Such particular ministries have existed from the first days of the Church by the commission of Christ. This says something more than does the Cranmer Ordinal about the threefold ministry of bishops, priests, and deacons having been in the Church since the time of the apostles. Such a ministry is "accepted" as the ministry of CSI because it "desires to maintain continuity with the historic ministry of the Church as it has come down to us from early times through the uniting Churches." The question is left open as to whether

CSI could have "accepted" another form of ministry as particular to it. It is ministry that is the gift of God; how that ministry is constituted is the prerogative of the Church under the leadership of the Spirit. This is to say exactly what the Roman Church has said about its capacity to divide the sacrament of orders into three parts, reserving the fullness of the sacrament to the bishop. It is also important to note that the historic ministry which the church desires to continue comes to it through all the uniting churches, not simply one of them. This is no less than an acceptance of the validity of the orders of all the uniting churches, or, from another perspective, the equal invalidity of all those orders because they existed in a state of disunion with other Christians.

The Preface says nothing about the precise nature of the offices of ministry, and it is to the rite itself that we must look for an explication of the episcopal burden. But first we must examine the way the rite deals with the old question of separation of orders. Is the CSI bishop a "presbyter unleashed," or is he a member of a clearly distinct and higher order? The rite does not answer the question, but leaves room for either interpretation. Most significant is the provision for the laying on of hands by presbyters at an episcopal consecration. They are not required, but they are permitted explicitly by the rubrics. Three bishops are required in keeping with the ancient pattern of representing the concurrence of the entire episcopate as a college in the ordination. It might be argued that the inclusion of the presbyters was a sop to the Presbyterians and a necessary compromise for the sake

of unity, and from the "catholic" point of view would make no difference provided the three bishops were included. Such a cynical observation says little for ecumenical integrity and implies that the church has consented to a liturgical deceit in order to salve the tender consciences of evangelicals and catholics alike, allowing each to continue to make its old professions while justifying them on the basis of the same liturgical texts. If the employment of presbyters is to make any sense it must be because they have something to convey in the act of consecration. If deacons and lay members were included (as they will be in COCU) one might argue that what is being conveyed is the authority which Christ has committed to the whole Church and which the Church now deposes in a particular ministry. But deacons and lay members are not included, therefore on the basis of the rubric alone it must be maintained that episcopal consecration is the setting apart of particular persons to exercise a ministry that is inherent in the presbyteral office but not realized without special consecration. Episcopacy is, in effect, a higher grade of the same order. This is reinforced by the use of the titles, "The Ordination of Presbyters" and "The Consecration of Bishops."

The consecratory prayer tries to have it both ways: "...do now ordain and consecrate bishop in thy Church." This is the only time the word "ordain" is employed in the service, but since it is part of the essential form of the ordination/consecration it cannot be overlooked. Its use can only be justified if we believe that the work of episcopacy, even though inherent in the presbyteral order, is so unique that the result of the consecration must produce a ministry that is evidently

distinct from the ordinary work of the presbyter. This distinction must be so pronounced as to justify calling the episcopate a third order and thus allowing for consecration by bishops alone.

It is when we compare the questions asked in the examination of candidates that we find the differences between the office and work of a presbyter and bishop. The first four questions are the same in both rites. They deal with the call to the office, motivation in accepting it, the scriptures as containing all things necessary to salvation, and the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds as safeguards of the faith. It is at the fifth question that the distinctions begin to appear.

Presbyter

Will you be diligent in the reading of the Holy Scriptures and in such studies as help to the knowledge of the same?

Bishop

Will you be diligent in the study of the Holy Scriptures, praying for a true understanding of them, that you may be able to feed your people with the Bread of life, to lead them in accordance with God's will, and to withstand and convince false teachers?

The question which is asked the bishop-elect includes an explanation of why he should be learned in the scriptures: to feed the people with the Bread of life, to lead them in accordance with God's will, and to withstand and convince false teachers. So the bishop is seen particularly as teacher, governor, and guardian. The sixth question addressed to the presbyter refers to the preaching task, but for the bishop it concerns administering discipline. Question seven makes clear the bishop's missionary responsibilities. The work of mission is not his alone, but he is to enable his people to participate in that work. The eighth

question is one which has no precedent in Anglican ordinals. It speaks of the bishop's oversight of worship in his diocese. This emphasizes his high priestly function, a function that had been lost in the earlier ordinals (see pp. 77-84). Question twelve, dealing with baptism, confirmation, and ordination, has the same implications since it deals with the bishop's liturgical responsibility. Question nine recalls the unifying role. The tenth question reminds the bishop that he is to set an example for the people in his personal life. The eleventh question concerns his responsibility for the poor and needy. This question is also asked, in slightly different form, of the presbyter, but its origins are in the rite for the consecration of bishops (see Note 26). It is in the last questions asked in the examination of presbyters that we learn something about the bishop's function in the Church: "Seeing you believe you are called to exercise this ministry within the Church of South India, will you accept its discipline and submit yourselves as sons in the gospel to those whom this Church shall appoint to have the rule over you?" The bishop, on the other hand, is asked only if he will act in accordance with the constitution of the Church and his diocese.

When we compare the prayers of ordination for presbyters and consecration for bishops we find that we learn more about the work of a presbyter than we do that of a bishop. The introductory prayer is the same for each order, but the essential form is much more explicit for the presbyter.

Presbyter

Send down thy Holy Spirit upon thy servant..., whom we, in thy Name, and in obedience to thy most blessed will, do now ordain presbyter in thy Church, committing unto him authority to minister thy Word and Sacraments, to declare thy forgiveness to penitent sinners, and to shepherd thy flock.

Nor does the last part of the prayer, which is different for each order, help much to distinguish the differences between the two.

Give them grace, we beseech thee, O Lord,

to offer with all thy people spiritual sacrifices acceptable to thee.

Enrich them in all utterance and all knowledge, that they may proclaim the gospel of thy salvation.

Make them watchful and loving guardians over thy flock, as followers of the Good Shepherd who gave his life for the sheep.

Enable them in all things to fulfil their ministry without reproach in thy sight; so that, abiding steadfast to the end, with all thy faithful servants they may be received into thine eternal joy;

The episcopal prayer differs in two major respects from the one for presbyters: the apostleship of the bishop is emphasized (ambassador of Christ) and the unifying role is stressed. Presbyters are guardians of

Bishop

Send down thy Holy Spirit upon thy servant..., whom we, in thy Name, and in obedience to thy most blessed will, do now ordain and consecrate bishop in thy Church.

Give him grace, we beseech thee,
to be a faithful ambassador of Christ to the world,
to offer with all thy people spiritual sacrifices acceptable to thee,

to feed and govern thy flock as a true shepherd,

and to promote love and unity among all thy people.
Deliver him from all assaults of the devil, and
grant that in all things he may fulfil his ministry without reproach in thy sight,
and, abiding steadfast to the end, may be received with all thy faithful servants into thine eternal glory;

the flock; bishops are to govern the flock. The fact that "guardians" is used in the presbyteral prayer only serves to confuse the issue about the difference in order, or at least to reflect the confusion of Acts 20: 17, 28 where, in the RSV, "guardians" is used as the translation for episkopoi. Because of the special nature of his responsibilities (one supposes), the bishop needs particularly the prayers of the people to strengthen him against temptation. It is not clear why the bishop should be received into glory and the presbyters into joy, unless the intention is to stress the dignitas of the higher gradus!

The Presentation of the Bible and Pastoral Staff adds nothing new to what has been said earlier in the service. The formula at the Presentation of the Bible reinforces the teaching office of the bishop, and that for the Pastoral Staff the office of governing and shepherding. The latter formula might have implications for the bishop as an agent of reconciliation: "hold up the weak, heal the sick, bind up the broken, bring again the outcast, seek the lost."

In summary, then, we may say that according to the consecration rite of the Church of South India, the episcopal office is in some manner inherent in the presbyterate, but it requires a special call and consecration for its exercise. That office is primarily one of teaching, governing, and guarding the faith, but includes such other responsibilities as direction of missionary activity and oversight of the liturgical life of the community.

THE ORDINATION OF A BISHOP
according to
The Roman Pontifical*

DE ORDINATIONE EPISCOPI

1. Ordinatio Episcopi fiat cum fidelium quam maxima frequentia die dominico vel festo, nisi rationes pastorales alium diem, ex. gr. festum Apostolorum, suadeant.
2. Episcopus Consecrator principalis debet saltem alios duos Episcopos consecrantes adhibere; sed decet ut omnes Episcopi praesentes una cum Consecratore principali Electum ordinent.

THE ORDINATION¹ OF A BISHOP

1. The ordination of a bishop should take place on a Sunday or holyday when a large number of the faithful can attend, unless pastoral reasons suggest another day, such as the feast of an apostle.²
2. The principal consecrator must be assisted by at least two other consecrating bishops, but it is fitting for all the bishops present together with the principal consecrator to ordain the bishop-elect.³

*Latin text from Pontificale Romanum: De Ordinatione Diaconi, Presbyteri et Episcopi (Vatican City, 1968), pp. 62-79, 117-20. Official translation from Ordination of Deacons, Priests and Bishops (Washington, D.C., 1979), pp. 89-106.

1. The title in the former rite was Consecratio. The change makes clear that a new order is being conveyed, even though those conveying it are still called consecratores.

2. The importance of the whole People of God as participants in the ordination is emphasized by this rubric, although it is difficult to understand why observing the feast of a particular apostle might be judged to be more pastoral than making provision for "a large number of the faithful."

3. This rubric preserves the tradition of three bishops as representative of the concurrence of the world-wide episcopate. It is fitting that all the bishops present participate because they are all part of that episcopal college which the electus will enter by virtue of his ordination.

3. Electo assistant duo Presbyteri.

3. Two priests⁴ assist the bishop-elect.

4. The International Committee on English in the Liturgy justifies its translation of presbyter as "priest" in the following way:

All these documents, together with the pertinent official texts of Vatican Council II, employ a terminology clearly distinguishing the threefold orders of ministerial office, a terminology that, with some variations, has prevailed since the letters of St. Ignatius of Antioch in the early second century: episcopus, presbyter and diaconus (and their cognate abstract and adjectival forms). In addition, another word, sacerdos (sacerdotium) is used as a more generic term, to designate what is common to the orders of episcopus and presbyter, in contradiction to the order of diaconus. In English, however, apart from the adjective "sacerdotal," we have only the one word "priest (priesthood)," that is used specifically for presbyter, or more generically for sacerdos. As a consequence, the clarity of needful distinctions achieved in Latin is impossible of achievement in English.

On the other hand, the translation of the term presbyter by "priest" has become entrenched in recent centuries, and widely defended on apologetically influenced theological grounds. Any radical departure from this presently common Catholic usage might therefore contribute to the very confusion that a satisfactory translation must seek to eliminate, or at least keep to a minimum.

A consistent resolution of the problem was found to be impossible. A distinction was accordingly made between the official documents (the Decree and the Apostolic Constitution), in which theological clarity was deemed paramount, and the ordination texts themselves and their rubrics, which will normally be heard or read by the faithful, and which should therefore take into account, so far as possible, traditional usage of terms.

(The Roman Pontifical, ICEL, Inc., Washington, D.C., 1975, p. ii)

What this official explanation does not say is that the Committee did prefer to use "presbyter" in the English translation (rather than translating it "priest"), but their decision was overruled when the proposed translation was submitted to Rome for approval (or so I have been informed by a staff member of ICEL). The explanation also adopts a patronizing attitude towards the faithful that hardly seems in keeping with Vatican II's Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity (Apostolicam Actuositatem).

4. Valde convenit, ut omnes Episcopi consecrantes necnon Presbyteri Electo assistentes cum Consecratore principali et cum Electo Missam concelebrent. Si ordinatio fit in ecclesia propria Electi, etiam aliqui Presbyteri eius Presbyterii concelebrent.

5. Si ordinatio fit in ecclesia propria Electi, Consecrator principalis Episcopum modo ordinatum invitare potest ut praesideat concelebrationi in liturgia eucharistica. Si autem ordinatio non fit in ecclesia Electi, Consecrator principalis praesidet concelebrationi; hoc in casu Episcopus modo ordinatus primum locum tenet inter ceteros concelebrantes.

6. Consecrator principalis necnon Episcopi et Presbyteri concelebrantes sacras vestes induunt quae ad Missae celebrationem requiruntur. Electus induit omnia paramenta sa-

4. It is most appropriate for all the consecrating bishops and the priests assisting the bishop-elect to concelebrate the Mass with the principal consecrator and with the bishop-elect. If the ordination takes place in the bishop-elect's own church, some priests of his diocese should also concelebrate.⁵

5. If the ordination takes place in the bishop-elect's own church, the principal consecrator may ask the newly ordained bishop to preside over the concelebration of the eucharistic liturgy.⁶ If the ordination does not take place in the bishop-elect's own church, the principal consecrator presides at the concelebration; in this case the new bishop takes the first place among the other concelebrants.

6. The principal consecrator and the concelebrating bishops and priests wear the vestments required for Mass. The bishop-elect wears all the priestly vestments, the

5. The former rite made no provision for concelebrating priests at an episcopal ordination. This emphasizes the collegial relationship of the bishop with the priests of his diocese.

6. There was no provision for this in the former rite. The change reflects Vatican II's concern for the primacy of the bishop in his own diocese.

cerdotalia necnon crucem pectoralem et dalmaticam. Episcopi autem consecrantes, qui non concelebrant, sumunt rochetum, amictum, crucem pectoralem, stolam, pluviale et mitram, Presbyteri Electo assistentes, si non concelebrant, induunt pluviale.

7. Benedictio anuli, baculi pastoralis et mitrae, tempore opportuno, ante ipsam ordinationem, de more peragitur.

8. Praeter ea quae ad Missae pontificalis concelebrationem necessaria sunt, parentur: a) Pontificale Romanum; b) libelli orationis Consecrationis pro Episcopis consecrantibus; c) gremiale linteum; d) sanctum chrisma; e) anulus, baculus pastoralis et mitra pro Electo.

pectoral cross, and the dalmatic.⁷ If the consecrating bishops do not concelebrate, they wear the rochet, amice, pectoral cross, stole, cope, and miter. If the priests assisting the bishop-elect do not concelebrate, they wear the cope.

7. The blessing of the ring, pastoral staff, and miter ordinarily takes place at a convenient time prior to the ordination service.⁸

8. In addition to what is needed for the concelebration of a pontifical Mass, there should be ready: a) the Roman Pontifical; b) copies of the consecratory prayer for the consecrating bishops; c) a linen gremial;⁹ d) holy chrism; e) a ring, staff, and miter for the

7. The bishop-elect wears the vestments appropriate to the two lower orders (dalmatic for the deacon, chasuble for the priest) as a sign that the episcopate contains the fullness of order and is its source. Formerly he would also have worn the tunicle, the vestment appropriate to the subdiaconate.

8. The blessing of the insignia outside the ordination service removes some of the solemnity from the act of presentation and allows the primary focus to be on the essential acts of prayer and imposition of hands.

9. The gremial is a cloth which is spread over the bishop's knees when he is administering holy chrism. This rubric underscores the importance of having a checklist of whatever is going to be necessary for the smooth operation of a service, an importance that some masters of ceremonies have learned too late and in embarrassing circumstances.

9. Sedes pro Consecratore principali, Episcopis consecrantibus, Electo, Presbyteris concelebrantibus parentur hoc modo:

a) In liturgia verbi Consecrator principalis sedeat in cathedra; Episcopi autem consecrantes iuxta cathedram; Electus vero inter Presbyteros sibi assistentes, loco aptiore in presbyterio.

b) Ordinatio Electi fiat de more ad cathedram; si autem propter participationem fidelium opus est, parentur sedes pro Consecratore principali et Episcopis consecrantibus ante altare vel alio opportuniore loco; sedes autem pro Electo et Presbyteris ei assistantibus sic parentur, ut actio liturgica a fidelibus bene conspici queat.

10. Omnibus rite dispositis, ordinatur processio per ecclesiam ad altare modo consueto. Subdiaconum librum Evangeliorum deferentem sequuntur Presbyteri concelebrantes, deinde Electus medius inter Presbyteros sibi assistentes, postea

bishop-elect.

9. Seats for the principal consecrator, consecrating bishops, the bishop-elect, and concelebrating priests are arranged as follows:

a) For the liturgy of the word, the principal consecrator should sit at the cathedra or bishop's chair, consecrating bishops near the chair. The bishop-elect sits between the assisting priests in an appropriate place within the sanctuary.

b) The ordination should usually take place at the bishop's chair; or, to enable the faithful to participate more fully, seats for the principal consecrator and consecrating bishops may be placed before the altar or elsewhere. Seats for the bishop-elect and his assisting priests should be placed so that the faithful may have a complete view of the liturgical rites.¹⁰

10. When everything is ready, the procession moves through the church to the altar in the usual way. The acolyte carries the book of gospels; he is followed by the priests who will concelebrate, the bishop-elect between the priests

10. This is another attempt to emphasize the participation of the whole priestly people.

Episcopi consecrantes ac denique
Episcopus Consecrator principalis
medius inter duos Diaconos.

11. Liturgia verbi peragitur ad
normam rubricarum.

12. Lectiones sumi possunt sive ex
toto sive ex parte vel e Missa diei
vel e textibus qui in Appendice
proponuntur.

Symbolum in Missa Ordinationis
non dicitur. Item, oratio fidelium
omittitur.

13. Dicto Evangelio, incipit Ordi-
natio Episcopi. Omnibus stantibus,
canitur hymnus Veni, Creator Spiri-
tus, vel alius hymnus huic respon-
dens, iuxta locorum consuetudines.

14. Consecrator principalis et
Episcopi consecrantes accedunt ad
sedes pro Ordinatione Electi para-

assisting him, the consecrating
bishops, and, finally, the princi-
pal consecrator between two deacons.

11. The liturgy of the word takes
place according to the rubrics.

12. The readings may be taken in
whole or in part from the Mass of
the day or from the texts suggested
in the appendix.¹¹

The profession of faith is not
said,¹² nor are the general inter-
cessions (prayer of the faithful).¹³

13. The ordination of a bishop be-
gins after the gospel. While all
stand, the hymn Veni, Creator Spiri-
tus is sung, or another hymn similar
to it, depending on local custom.¹⁴

14. The principal consecrator and
the consecrating bishops, wearing
their miters, go to the seats pre-

11. A list of the readings is printed here at the end of the rite. An examination of all the lections for all the rites will be found at the end of this chapter.

12. The Roman rite is unique in its omission of the Creed. The other rites tend to see the recitation of the Creed as symbolic of the bishop's role as teacher and guardian of the faith. See particularly ECUSA.

13. The Litany of the Saints takes the place of the prayer of the faithful. With its ora pro nobis, it might be said to be the prayer of the most faithful.

14. See CSI, note 30. This represents the most radical alteration in the use of this hymn in any of the rites under examination. It is moved from the very heart of the consecratory prayer to being an optional opening hymn!

tas, et sedent cum mitra.

15. Electus a Presbyteris ipsi assistentibus adducitur ante sedem Consecratoris principalis, cui reverentiam facit.

16. Unus e Presbyteris alloquitur Consecratorem principalem his verbis:

Reverendissime Pater, postulat Ecclesia N., ut Presbyterum N.N. ad onus Episcopatus ordines.

Si vero agitur de Episcopo ordinando non residentiali:

Reverendissime Pater, postulat sancta Mater Ecclesia Catholica, ut Presbyterum N.N. ad onus Episcopatus ordines.

Consecrator principalis illum

pared for the ordination and sit.

15. The bishop-elect is led by his assisting priests to the chair of the principal consecrator, before whom he makes a sign of reverence.

16. One of the priests addresses the principal consecrator:¹⁵

Most Reverend Father, the Church of N. asks you to ordain this priest N.N. for service as bishop.

If the bishop-elect is not to be ordained as a residential bishop:¹⁶

Most Reverend Father, our holy mother the Catholic Church asks you to ordain¹⁷ this priest N.N. for service as bishop.

The principal consecrator asks

15. Formerly the presentation was made by another bishop. This change emphasizes that the bishop is the choice of the diocese, and is being presented by them to be ordained to leadership among them.

16. These two forms of presentation preserve the distinction between relative (residential) and absolute (for other than diocesan service) ordination. For a discussion of the issues involved, see K. Rahner, Theological Investigations, Vol. 6 (London, 1969), pp. 330-33. In the former rite all ordinations were absolute in that only the second form of presentation was employed. The change is another attempt to restore the unique relationship that exists between diocese and bishop and to recognize that each diocese is a Church in its own right. See Lumen Gentium 23 and Christus Dominus 11.

17. In the former rite, subelevetis. The change insures against interpreting the rite as the raising of a priest to a higher grade of the same order.

interrogat, dicens:

Habetis mandatum Apostolicum?

Ille respondet:

Habemus.

Consecrator principalis:

Legatur.

17. Tunc legitur mandatum, omnibus
sedentibus. Quo perlecto, omnes
dicunt:

Deo gratias,
vel alio modo, iuxta morem regio-
nis, electioni assentiunt.

18. Deinde Consecrator principalis,
omnibus sedentibus, breviter allo-
quitur clerum ac populum necnon
Electum de munere Episcopi; quod
facere potest his verbis:

Dilectissimi, sedulo attendite,
ad qualem in Ecclesia gradum frater
noster sit provehendus. Dominus
noster Iesus Christus, a Patre mis-

him:

Have you a mandate from the Holy
See?

He replies:

We have.

The principal consecrator:

Let it be read out.

Everyone sits while the document
is read.

17. After the reading, all present
say:

Thanks be to God,
or give their assent to the choice
in some other way, according to
local custom.¹⁸

18. Then all sit, and the princi-
pal consecrator briefly addresses
the clergy, people, and the bishop-
elect on the duties of a bishop.
He may use these words:¹⁹

Consider carefully the position
in the Church to which our brother
is about to be raised. Our Lord
Jesus Christ, who was sent by the

18. This is a pale reflection of the days when election was by people
or chapter, but it represents a positive change from the former rite
where only the principal consecrator made the response.

19. In the former rite, the Instruction consisted of a single sentence:
Episcopum oportet iudicare, interpretari, consecrare, ordinare, offerre,
baptizare et confirmare (It is the bishop's duty to pass judgment, to in-
terpret, to consecrate, to ordain, to offer sacrifice, to baptize, and to
confirm). The homily now suggested is essentially a paraphrase of large
sections of Lumen Gentium and is as concerned with ontology as function.

sus, ut genus humanum redimeret, ipse in mundum duodecim misit Apostolos qui, Spiritus Sancti virtute repleti, Evangelium praedicarent et omnes gentes in unum ovile congregantes, sanctificarent et gubernarent. Ut autem hoc munus usque ad finem saeculi permaneret, Apostoli sibi adiutores elegerunt, quibus donum Spiritus Sancti a Christo acceptum per impositionem manuum tradiderunt, qua Ordinis sacramenti plenitudo confertur. Sic a generatione in generationem principalis traditio per successionem Episcoporum continuam servata est et opus Salvatoris ad nostra usque tempora perseverat et crescit.

In Episcopo a Presbyteris suis circumdato adest in medio vestri ipse Dominus noster Iesus Christus, Pontifex factus in aeternum. Ipse enim in ministerio Episcopi Evangelium praedicare et credentibus mysteria fidei ministrare non desinit. Ipse paterno Episcopi munere nova membra corpori suo addit et aggregat. Ipse Episcopi sapientia et

Father to redeem the human race, in turn sent twelve apostles into the world. These men were filled with the power of the Holy Spirit to preach the Gospel and gather every race and people into a single flock to be guided and governed in the way of holiness. Because this service was to continue to the end of time, the apostles selected others to help them. By the laying on of hands which confers the sacrament of orders in its fullness, the apostles passed on the gift of the Holy Spirit which they themselves had received from Christ. In that way, by a succession of bishops unbroken from one generation to the next, the powers conferred in the beginning were handed down, and the work of the Savior lives and grows in our time.²⁰

In the person of the bishop, with his priests around him, Jesus Christ, the Lord, who became High Priest for ever, is present among you. Through the ministry of the bishop, Christ himself continues to proclaim the Gospel and to confer the mysteries of faith on those who believe. Through the fatherly action of the bishop, Christ adds new

20. See Lumen Gentium 19-21.

prudencia vos in peregrinatione
terrena ad beatitudinem perducit
aeternam.

Grato igitur laetoque animo fratrem nostrum excipite, quem nos, Episcopi, per impositionem manuum in collegium nostrum cooptamus. Illum honorate ut ministrum Christi et dispensatorem mysteriorum Dei, cui testificatio Evangelii veritatis concreditur atque ministratio spiritus et iustitiae. Mementote verborum Christi dicentis Apostolis: "Qui vos audit me audit, et qui vos spernit me spernit. Qui autem me spernit, spernit eum qui me misit".

Tu autem, frater carissime, electus a Domino, cogita te ex hominibus esse assumptum et pro hominibus constitutum^u in iis quae sunt ad Deum. Episcopatus enim nomen est operis, non honoris, et Episcopum magis prodesse quam praeesse oportet. Nam qui maior

members to his body. Through the bishop's wisdom and prudence, Christ guides you in your earthly pilgrimage toward eternal happiness.²¹

Gladly and gratefully, therefore, receive our brother whom we are about to accept into the college of bishops by the laying on of hands. Respect him as a minister of Christ and a steward of the mysteries of God. He has been entrusted with the task of witnessing to the truth of the Gospel and fostering a spirit of justice and holiness. Remember the words of Christ spoken to the apostles: "Whoever listens to you listens to me; whoever rejects you rejects me, and those who reject me reject the one who sent me."²²

You, dear brother, have been chosen by the Lord. Remember that you are chosen from among men and appointed to act for men and women²³ in relation to God. The title of bishop is one not of honor but of function,^{23a} and therefore a bishop should strive to serve rather than

21. Lumen Gentium 21

22. L.G. 20-21

23. "Women," in the English translation, makes explicit the generic nature of hominibus.

23a. Cf. Leofric rite (Appendix B), line 27: "Sacerdotium ipsum opus esse existimet non dignitatem."

est, secundum Magistri praeceptum, sit ut minor, et qui praecessor est, sicut ministrator. Praedica opportune, importune, increp^a in omni patientia et doctrina. In oratione et sacrificio pro populo tibi commisso, de plenitudine sanctitatis Christi multiformem gratiam abundanter studeas impetrare.

In Ecclesia tibi credita, mysteriorum Christi dispensator, moderator et custos esto fidelis. Electus a Patre ad eius gubernandam familiam, memor esto semper boni Pastoris, qui oves suas cognoscit et quem oves cognoscunt, et qui animam ponere pro ovibus suis non dubitavit.

Universos, quos Deus tibi committit, paterna atque fraterna dilige caritate, imprimis Presbyteros et Diaconos, tuos in ministerio Christi consortes, sed et pauperes

to rule. Such is the counsel of the Master: the greatest should behave as if he were the least, and the leader as if he were the one who serves. Proclaim the message whether it is welcome or unwelcome; correct error with unfailing patience and teaching. Pray and offer sacrifice for the people²⁴ committed to your care and so draw every kind of grace for them from the overflowing holiness of Christ.²⁵

As a steward of the mysteries of Christ in the Church entrusted to you, be a faithful overseer and guardian. Since you are chosen by the Father to rule over his family, always be mindful of the Good Shepherd, who knows his sheep and is known by them and who does not hesitate to lay down his life for them.²⁶

As a father and a brother, love all those whom God places in your care. Love the priests and deacons who share with you in the ministry of Christ. Love the poor and in-

24. When this is compared with "offer spiritual sacrifices with the people" in CSI and COCU, one^{sees} the wide gulf in understanding about the nature of episcopal ministry.

25. See Lumen Gentium 26-27 and Christus Dominus 15.

26. Ibid.

et debiles, peregrinos et advenas. Hortare fideles ut in opere apostolico tecum laborent, eosque libenter audire ne renuas. De illis autem, qui nondum uni Christi ovili sunt aggregati, curam habeas indefessam, tamquam tibi in Domino commendatis. In Ecclesia catholica, caritatis vinculo adunata, numquam obliviscaris te collegio Episcoporum esse coniunctum, ita ut omnium Ecclesiarum sollicitudinem ferre non desinas et Ecclesiis auxilio egentibus libenter subvenias. Attende igitur universo gregi in quo Spiritus Sanctus te ponit regere Dei Ecclesiam, in nomine Patris, cuius in Ecclesia imaginem repraesentas, et in nomine Filii eius Iesu Christi, cuius munere Doctoris, Sacerdotis et Pastoris fungeris, et in nomine Spiritus Sancti, qui Ecclesiam Christi vivificat et infirmitatem nostram sua virtute confirmat.

19. Post allocutionem, Electus surgit et stat ante Consecratorem principalem, qui illum interrogat

firm, strangers and the homeless. Encourage the faithful to work with you in your apostolic task; listen willingly to what they have to say. Never relax your concern for those who do not yet belong to the one fold of Christ; they too are commended to you in the Lord. Never forget that in the Catholic Church, made one by the bond of Christian love, you are incorporated in the college of bishops. You should therefore have a constant concern for all the churches and gladly come to the aid and support of churches in need. Attend to the whole flock in which the Holy Spirit appoints you an overseer of the Church of God - in the name of the Father, whose image you personify in the Church - and in the name of his Son Jesus Christ, whose role of Teacher, Priest, and Shepherd you undertake - and in the name of the Holy Spirit, who gives life to the Church of Christ and supports our weakness with his strength.²⁷

19. The bishop-elect then rises and stands in front of the principal consecrator, who questions

27. This paragraph is a digest of the principles enunciated in Christus Dominus; see especially Par. 16.

his verbis:

Antiqua sanctorum Patrum institutio praecipit, ut, qui Episcopus ordinandus est, coram populo interrogetur de proposito fidei servandae et muneris exsequendi.

Vis ergo, frater carissime, munus nobis ab Apostolis creditum et tibi per impositionem manuum nostrarum tradendum cum gratia Spiritus Sancti usque ad mortem explere?

Electus respondet:

Volo.

Consecrator principalis:

Vis Evangelium Christi fideliter et indesinenter praedicare?

Electus:

Volo.

Consecrator principalis:

Vis depositum fidei, secundum traditionem inde ab Apostolis in Ecclesia semper et ubique servatam, purum et integrum custodire?

Electus:

Volo.

him:²⁸

An age-old custom of the Fathers decrees that a bishop-elect is to be questioned before the people on his resolve to uphold the faith and to discharge his duties faithfully.

My brother, are you resolved by the grace of the Holy Spirit to discharge to the end of your life the office the apostles entrusted to us, which we now pass on to you by the laying on of hands?

The bishop-elect replies:

I am.

The principal consecrator:

Are you resolved to be faithful and constant in proclaiming the Gospel of Christ?

The elect:

I am.

The principal consecrator:

Are you resolved to maintain the deposit of faith, entire and incorrupt, as handed down by the apostles and professed by the Church everywhere and at all times?²⁹

The elect:

I am.

28. The questions have undergone considerable change from the former rite. A long series on the doctrine of the Trinity is no longer asked, nor or any of the former questions regarding the scriptures.

29. This emphasizes that the entire episcopate and not just the pope is the custodian of the deposit of faith.

Consecrator principalis:

Vis corpus Christi, Ecclesiam eius, aedificare et in eius unitate cum ordine Episcoporum, sub auctoritate successoris beati Petri Apostoli, permanere?

Electus:

Volo.

Consecrator principalis:

Vis beati Petri Apostoli successori oboedientiam fideliter exhibere?

Electus:

Volo.

Consecrator principalis:

Vis plebem Dei sanctam, cum ministris tuis Presbyteris et Diaconis, ut pius pater, fovere et in viam salutis dirigere?

Electus:

Volo.

Consecrator principalis:

Vis pauperibus et peregrinis omnibusque indigentibus propter

The principal consecrator:

Are you resolved to build up the Church as the body of Christ and to remain united to it within the order of bishops under the authority of the successor of the apostle Peter?

The elect:

I am.

The principal consecrator:

Are you resolved to be faithful in your obedience to the successor of the apostle Peter?³⁰

The elect:

I am.

The principal consecrator:

Are you resolved as a devoted father to sustain the people of God and to guide them in the way of salvation in cooperation with the priests and deacons who share your ministry?

The elect:

I am.

The principal consecrator:

Are you resolved to show kindness and compassion in the name of the

30. This and the previous question indicate that the bishop is related and responsible to the pope in two ways: first, as a member of the episcopal college he and the other members are only able to act in co-operation with the Petrine authority (Lumen Gentium 22); secondly, the bishop is dependent upon the pope's recognition of his individual right to assume and hold office (L.G. 24).

nomen Domini affabilem et misericordem te praeberere?

Electus:

Volo.

Consecrator principalis:

Vis oves errantes ut bonus pastor requirere et ovili dominico aggregare?

Electus:

Volo.

Consecrator principalis:

Vis Deum omnipotentem pro populo sancto indesinentur orare et sine reprehensione summi sacerdotii munus explere?

Electus:

Volo, Deo auxiliante.

Consecrator principalis:

Qui coepit in te opus bonum, Deus, ipse perficiat.

20. Deinde omnes surgunt, Consecrator principalis, stans sine mitra, manibus iunctis, versus ad populum dicit:

Oremus, dilectissimi nobis, ut huic Electo, utilitati Ecclesiae

Lord to the poor and to strangers and to all who are in need?³¹

The elect:

I am.

The principal consecrator:

Are you resolved as a good shepherd to seek out the sheep who stray and to gather them into the fold of the Lord?

The elect:

I am.

The principal consecrator:

Are you resolved to pray for the people of God without ceasing, and to carry out the duties of one who has the fullness of the priesthood so as to afford no grounds for reproach?

The elect:

I am, with the help of God.

The principal consecrator:

May God who has begun the good work in you bring it to fulfillment.

20. Then all stand. The principal consecrator, without his miter,³² faces the people and, with hands joined, sings or says:

Let us pray, my dear people, that almighty God in his goodness

31. This is the only question retained from the former rite. See CSI, Note 26.

32. Formerly miters were worn for the Invitation and the Litany.

providens, benignitas omnipotentis Dei gratiae suae tribuat largitatem.

Diaconus:

Flectamus genua.

21. Et mox Consecrator principalis et Episcopi consecrantes ante sedes suas genua flectunt; Electus vero procumbit; ceteri autem genua flectunt.

Tunc cantores incipiunt Litanias, in quibus addi possunt, suis locis, aliqua nomina Sanctorum (ex. gr., Patroni, Tituli ecclesiae, Fundatoris, Patroni eorum ^{qui} Ordinationem recipiunt, etc.) aut aliquae invocationes magis aptae singulis circumstantiis.

will pour out his grace upon this man whom he has chosen to provide for the needs of the Church.³³

The deacon:

Let us kneel.

21. The principal consecrator and the consecrating bishops kneel at their places, the bishop-elect prostrates himself, and the rest kneel.

The cantors begin the litany; they may add, at the proper place, names of other saints (for example, the patron saint, the titular of the church, the founder of the church, the patron saints of those to be ordained) or petitions suitable to the occasion.³⁴

33. The Invitation to Prayer is essentially the same as in the former rite except dilectissimi nobis for fratres carissimi, a change which indicates that all the people present are being addressed and not simply the bishops and clergy.

34. Changes in the Litany of the Saints from the former rite:

(a) Trinitarian invocations are omitted after the initial Kyries.

(b) The BVM is invoked once rather than three times.

(c) The following are now omitted: Gabriel, Raphael, all you holy orders of blessed spirits, all you holy patriarchs and prophets, James, Thomas, James, Philip, Bartholomew, Matthew, Simon, Thaddeus, Matthias, Barnabas, Luke, Mark, all you holy apostles and evangelists, all you holy disciples of the Lord, all you Holy Innocents, Vincent, Fabian and Sebastian, John and Paul, Cosmas and Damian, Gervase and Pro-tase, all you holy martyrs, Sylvester, Ambrose, Jerome, Nicholas, all you holy bishops and confessors, all you holy doctors, Anthony, Bernard, all

Kyrie, eleison.		Lord, have mercy.	
Kyrie, eleison.		Lord, have mercy.	
Christe, eleison.		Christ, have mercy.	
Christe, eleison.		Christ, have mercy.	
Kyrie, eleison.		Lord, have mercy.	
Kyrie, eleison.		Lord, have mercy.	
Sancta Maria, Mater Dei,	<u>ora</u>	Holy Mary, Mother of God	<u>pray</u>
Sancte Michael,		Saint Michael	
Sancti Angeli Dei,	(<u>orate</u>)	Holy angels of God	
Sancte Ioseph,		Saint Joseph	
Sancte Ioannes Baptista,	<u>pro</u>	Saint John the Baptist ³⁵	<u>for</u>
Sancti Petre et Paule,		Saint Peter and Saint Paul	
Sancte Andrea,	<u>nobis.</u>	Saint Andrew	<u>us.</u>
Sancte Ioannes,		Saint John	
Sancta Maria Magdalena,		Saint Mary Magdalene	
Sancte Stephane,		Saint Stephen	
Sancte Laurenti,		Saint Lawrence	
Sancte Ignati Antiochene,		Saint Ignatius of Antioch	
Sancta Agnes,		Saint Agnes	

you holy priests and Levites, all you holy monks and hermits, Agatha, Lucy, Anastasia, all you holy virgins and widows.

(d) The following have been added to the Litany: Ignatius of Antioch, Perpetua and Felicity, Athanasius, Basil, Francis Xavier, John Vianney, Teresa.

(e) The petitions for deliverance have been reduced to three from eleven.

(f) The "mighty acts" petitions have been reduced to three from nine.

(g) The petitions for Church and people have been reduced and modified.

35. St. Joseph and St. John the Baptist are reversed in the English translation, thus maintaining the order of the former Litany.

Sanctae Perpetua et Felicitas,		Saint Perpetua and Saint Felicity ³⁶	
Sancte Gregori,		Saint Gregory	
Sancte Augustine,		Saint Augustine	
Sancte Athanasi,		Saint Athanasius	
Sancte Basili,		Saint Basil	
Sancte Martine,		Saint Martin	
Sancte Benedicte,		Saint Benedict	
Sancti Francisce et Dominice,		Saint Francis and Saint Dominic	
Sancte Francisce Xaveri,		Saint Francis Xavier	
Sancte Ioannes Maria Vianney,		Saint John Vianney ³⁷	
Sancta Theresia,		Saint Teresa of Avila	
Sancta Catharina Senensis,		Saint Catherine of Siena	
Omnes Sancti et Sanctae Dei,		All holy men and women	
Propitius esto,	<u>libera</u>	Lord, be merciful	<u>Lord,</u>
Ab omni malo,	<u>nos,</u>	From all evil	<u>save</u>
Ab omni peccato,	<u>Domine.</u>	From every sin	<u>your</u>
A morte perpetua,		From everlasting death	<u>people.</u>
Per incarnationem tuam,		By your coming as man	
Per mortem et resurrectionem tuam,		By your death and rising to new life	
Per effusionem Spiritus Sancti,		By your gift of the Holy Spirit	
Peccatores,	<u>te rogamus,</u>	Be merciful to us sinners	<u>Lord,</u>
Ut Ecclesiam tuam sanctam	<u>audi</u>	Guide and protect your	<u>hear</u>
regere et conservare	<u>nos.</u>	holy Church	<u>our</u>
digneris,			<u>prayer.</u>
Ut domnum apostolicum et omnes ec-		Keep the pope and all the clergy	
clesiasticos ordines in sancta		in faithful service to your	
religione conservare digneris,		Church	
Ut cunctis populis pacem et veram		Bring all peoples together in	
concordiam donare digneris,		trust and peace	

36. The order in the English translation is Ignatius, Lawrence, Perpetua and Felicity, Agnes.

37. The Curé d'Ars, patron saint of parish priests.

Ut nosmetipsos in tuo sancto servi-
tio confortare et conservare
digneris,

Ut hunc electum benedicere digneris,

Ut hunc electum benedicere et
sanctificare digneris,

Ut hunc electum benedicere et
sanctificare et consecrare
digneris,

Iesu, Fili Dei vivi,

Christe, audi nos.

Christe, audi nos.

Christe, exaudi nos.

Christe, exaudi nos.

22. Litaniis expletis, solus Con-
secrator principalis surgit et,
manibus iunctis, dicit:

Propitiare, Domine, supplicati-
onibus nostris, et inclinatio super
hunc famulum tuum cornu gratiae
sacerdotalis, benedictionis tuae
in eum effunde virtutem. Per
Christum Dominum nostrum.

R. Amen.

Strengthen us in your service

Bless this chosen man

Bless this chosen man and
make him holy

Bless this chosen man, make him
holy, and consecrate him for
his sacred duties

Jesus, Son of the living God

Christ, hear us

Christ, hear us

Lord Jesus, hear our prayer

Lord Jesus, hear our prayer

22. After the litany, the princi-
pal consecrator alone stands and,
with hands joined, sings or says:

Lord,

be moved by our prayers.

Anoint your servant

with the fullness of priestly grace,
and bless him with spiritual power
in all its richness.

We ask this through Christ our
Lord.³⁸

R. Amen.

38. In the former rite Propitiare was said by all the consecrating bishops after the imposition of hands with the formula Accipe Spiritum Sanctum had taken place. It served as an introduction to the major consecratory prayer. It is now said by the principal consecrator alone and serves as a conclusion to the Litany as well as an introduction to the solemn moment of ordination. See Appendix F for a structural comparison of the former and present rites.

Diaconus:

Levate.

23. Omnes surgunt; Consecrator principalis et Episcopi consecrantes stant ante sedes suas, versi ad populum. Electus surgit, ad Consecratorem principalem accedit et ante eum genua flectit.

24. Consecrator principalis imponit manus super caput Electi, nihil dicens. Similiter faciunt post eum ceteri Episcopi.

25. Deinde Consecrator principalis imponit librum Evangeliorum apertum super caput Electi; duo Diaconi, a dexteris et sinistris Electi stantes, tenent librum Evangeliorum supra caput ipsius usquedum oratio Consecrationis finiatur.

26. Tunc Consecrator principalis, extensis manibus, dicit orationem Consecrationis:

Deus et Pater Domini nostri Iesu Christi, Pater misericordiarum et Deus totius consolationis, qui in excelsis habitas et humilia

The deacon says:

Let us stand.

23. All rise. The principal consecrator and the consecrating bishops stand at their places, facing the people. The bishop-elect rises, goes to the principal consecrator, and kneels before him.

24. The principal consecrator lays his hands upon the head of the bishop-elect in silence. After him, the consecrating bishops do the same.³⁹

25. Then the principal consecrator places the open book of gospels upon the head of the bishop-elect; two deacons, standing at either side of the bishop-elect, hold the book of gospels above his head until the prayer of consecration is completed.

26. Next the principal consecrator, with his hands extended, sings the prayer of consecration or says it aloud:⁴⁰

God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ,
Father of mercies and God of all consolation,

39. This constitutes the essential matter of the ordination.

40. This is a slight adaptation of the Hippolytus ordination prayer. See Appendix A for the original and pp. 53-62 for an analysis of it. The former rite used the prayer found in Appendix C.

respicis, qui cognoscis omnia antequam nascantur, tu qui dedisti in Ecclesia tua normas per verbum gratiae tuae, qui praedestinasti ex principio genus iustorum ab Abraham, qui constituisti principes et sacerdotes, et sanctuarium tuum sine ministerio non dereliquisti, cui ab initio mundi placuit in his quos elegisti glorificari:

Sequens pars orationis ab omnibus Episcopis consecrantibus profertur, manibus iunctis:

Et nunc effunde super hunc

you dwell in heaven,
yet look with compassion on all that is humble.
You know all things before they come to be;
by your gracious word
you have established the plan of your Church.⁴¹

From the beginning you chose the descendants of Abraham to be your holy nation.

You established rulers and priests,⁴²
and did not leave your sanctuary without ministers to serve you.
From the creation of the world
you have been pleased to be glorified

by those whom you have chosen.

The following part of the prayer is recited by all the consecrating bishops, with hands joined:⁴³

So now pour out upon this chosen one

41. Hence episcopacy is de jure divino.

42. It should be noted that where "priest" and its related terms are used in this prayer they reflect the generic sacerdos. See Note 4.

43. It is this section of the prayer that was determined by Pope Paul VI to be the essential form of the ordination of a bishop in his Apostolic Constitution of 18 June 1968. It is a prayer for the power of the "governing Spirit" (Spiritus principalem), the same Spirit given by the Father to Christ, and in turn given by him to the apostles. Thus the function of leadership is the one isolated to describe what is desired for the ordinand in that part of the prayer officially defined as being indispensable to the creation of a bishop in the Roman church.

Electum eam virtutem, quae a te
est, Spiritum principalem, quem
dedisti dilecto Filio tuo Iesu
Christo, quem ipse donavit sanctis
Apostolis, qui constituerunt Ec-
clesiam per singula loca ut sanc-
tuarium tuum, in gloriam et laudem
indeficientem nominis tui.

Prosequitur solus Consecrator
principalis:

Da, cordium cognitor Pater, hu-
ic servo tuo, quem elegisti ad
Episcopatum, ut pascat gregem sanc-
tum tuum, et summum sacerdotium ti-
bi exhibeat sine reprehensione,
serviens tibi nocte et die, ut in-
cessanter vultum tuum propitium
reddat et offerat dono sanctae Ec-
clesiae tuae; da ut virtute Spiri-
tus summi sacerdotii habeat potes-
tatem dimittendi peccata secundum
mandatum tuum; ut distribuat mu-
nera secundum praeceptum tuum et
solvat omne vinculum secundum po-
testatem quam dedisti Apostolis;
placeat tibi in mansuetudine et
mundo corde, offerens tibi odorem
suavitatis, per Filium tuum Iesum
Christum, per quem tibi gloria et
potentia et honor, cum Spiritu

that power which is from you,
the governing Spirit
whom you gave to your beloved Son,
Jesus Christ,
the Spirit given by him to the holy
apostles,
who founded the Church in every
place
to be your temple
for the unceasing glory and praise
of your name.

Then the principal consecrator
continues alone:

Father, you know all hearts.
You have chosen your servant for
the office of bishop.
May he be a shepherd to your holy
flock,
and a high priest blameless in
your sight,
ministering to you night and day;
may he always gain the blessing of
your favor
and offer the gifts of your holy
Church.

Through the Spirit who gives the
grace of high priesthood
grant him the power
to forgive sins as you have commanded,
to assign ministries as you have
decreed,
and to loose every bond
by the authority which you gave to

Sancto in sancta Ecclesia et nunc
et in saecula saeculorum.

Omnes:

Amen.

27. Finita oratione Consecrationis,
Diaconi resumunt librum Evangelio-
rum, quem tenebant supra caput Or-
dinati, et unus Diaconorum librum
tenet usquedum tradatur Ordinato.
Consecrator principalis et Episcopi
consecrantes sedent cum mitra.

28. Consecrator principalis sumit
gremiale linteum et sancto chrisma-
te inungit caput Ordinati coram se
genuflexi, dicens:

your apostles.

May he be pleasing to you
by his gentleness and purity of
heart,
presenting a fragrant offering to
you,
through Jesus Christ, your Son,
through whom glory and power and
honor are yours
with the Holy Spirit
in your holy Church,
now and for ever.

R. Amen.

27. After the prayer of consecra-
tion, the deacons remove the book
of gospels which they have been
holding above the head of the new
bishop. One of them holds the book
until it is given to the bishop.
The principal consecrator and the
consecrating bishops, wearing their
miters, sit.

28. The principal consecrator puts
on a linen gremial, takes the
chrism, and anoints the head of the
bishop,⁴⁴ who kneels before him.

44. The previous rite had two anointings, one of the head midway through the consecratory prayer, and the other of the hands at the conclusion of the prayer. Since the hands of the priest (presbyter) are anointed at his ordination, a repetition seems needless. "At first this anointing of the hands was done only when a man went directly from the diaconate to the episcopate; it was not repeated if the candidate was already a priest"

Deus, qui summi Christi sacerdotii participem te effecit, ipse te mysticae delibutionis liquore perfundat, et spiritualis benedictionis ubertate fecundet.

Deinde Consecrator principalis lavat manus.

29. Consecrator principalis tradit Ordinato librum Evangeliorum, dicens:

He says:

God has brought you to share in the high priesthood of Christ. May he pour out on you the oil of mystical anointing and enrich you with spiritual blessings.⁴⁵

The principal consecrator washes his hands.

29. He then hands the book of gospels to the newly ordained bishop, saying:⁴⁶

(W.J. O'Shea, "Ordinations in the Roman Rite," New Catholic Encyclopedia [New York, 1967], vol. 10, p. 729). The anointing of the head signifies the bishop as head of the diocese, and the act itself is reminiscent of the anointings of the kings of Israel to rule over the chosen people. Again, the function of leadership is underscored. See also G. Ellard, Ordination Anointings in the Western Church before 1000 A.D. (Cambridge, Mass., 1933).

45. This prayer is an abbreviation of a longer prayer used at the anointing of the hands in the former rite:

Deus et Pater Domini nostri Iesu Christi, qui te ad Pontificatus sublimari voluit dignitatem, ipse te chrismate et mysticae delibutionis liquore perfundat, et spiritualis benedictionis ubertate fecundet; quidquid benedixeris, benedicatur; et quidquid sanctificaveris, sanctificetur; et consecratae manus istius vel pollicis imposito cunctis proficiat ad salutem.

May God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who has been pleased to raise you to the dignity of a bishop, pour out upon you this chrism, the oil of mystical anointing, and make you fruitful with fullness of spiritual blessing; what you bless may it be blessed, what you hallow be it hallowed, and may the imposition of this consecrated hand or thumb promote the salvation of all.

46. II Tim. 4:2. See Appendix F to compare the order of the delivery of the insignia between the former and present rites. The giving of the gospels first emphasizes the evangelical source of the apostolic office

Accipe Evangelium et verbum
Dei praedica in omni patientia
et doctrina.

30. Consecrator principalis anulum
in digitum anularem dexteræ manus
Ordinati immittit, dicens:

Accipe anulum, fidei signaculum:
et sponsam Dei, sanctam Ecclesiam,
intemerata fide ornatus, illibate
custodi.

31. Deinde Consecrator principalis
imponit Ordinato mitram, nihil di-
cens.

Receive the Gospel and preach
the word of God with unfailing
patience and sound teaching.

30. The principal consecrator
places the ring on the ring finger
of the new bishop's right hand,
saying:

Take this ring, the seal of your
fidelity.

With faith and love protect the
bride of God, his holy Church.⁴⁷

31. Then the principal consecrator
places the miter on the head of
the new bishop in silence.⁴⁸

and the mandate from which all else is consequent.

47. The formula at the presentation of the ring is essentially unchanged
from the former rite.

48. The presentation of the miter in silence is a radical change from
the former rite which contained the following prayer:

Imponimus, Domine, capiti huius An-
tistitis et agonistæ tui galeam
munitionis et salutis, quatenus,
decorata facie et armato capite
cornibus utriusque Testamenti, ter-
ribilis appareat adversariis veri-
tatis; et, te ei largiente gratiam,
impugnator eorum robustus existat,
qui Moyse famuli tui faciem, ex tui
sermonis consortio decoratam, luci-
dissimis tuæ claritatis ac verita-
tis cornibus insignisti, et capiti
Aaron Pontificis tui tiaram imponi
iussisti.

Lord, on the head of this your bi-
shop and champion, we put the hel-
met of defense and salvation, so
that with forehead thus adorned,
head armed with the horns of both
Testaments, he may appear fearsome
to the enemies of truth. Let him
stand forth as their formidable
adversary, sustained by your grace,
you who adorned the face of your
servant Moses, radiant after con-
verse with you, with the resplen-
dent horns of your brightness and
your truth and commanded a miter
to be set on the head of your high
priest Aaron.

Silence is perhaps preferable to such an attempt to attach meaning to what
originated as honorific headgear, adopted from the customs of the times,
and which has had no obvious symbolic value other than that over the cen-

32. Ac tandem tradit Ordinato baculum pastoralem, dicens:

Accipe baculum, pastoralis muneris signum, et attende universo gregi, in quo te Spiritus Sanctus posuit Episcopum regere Ecclesiam Dei.

33. Surgunt omnes. Si Ordinatio fit ad cathedram, Consecrator principalis Episcopum in ecclesia propria Ordinatam invitat, ut sedeat in cathedra; ipse vero Consecrator principalis sedet ad dexteram Ordinati; Episcopus autem extra ecclesiam propriam ordinatus invitatur a Consecratore principali, ut sedeat primus inter Episcopos concelebrantes.

Si autem Ordinatio non fit ad

32. Lastly, he gives the pastoral staff to the bishop, and says:

Take this staff as a sign of your pastoral office:

keep watch over the whole flock in which the Holy Spirit has appointed you

to shepherd the Church of God.⁴⁹

33. All stand. If the ordination takes place at the bishop's chair and if the new bishop is in his own church, the principal consecrator invites him to occupy the chair;⁵⁰ in that case, the principal consecrator sits at the right of the newly ordained bishop. If the new bishop is not in his own church, he is invited by the principal consecrator to take the first place among the concelebrating bishops.

If the ordination does not take

turies in the Western church we have been conditioned to equate the miter with episcopal authority. "...the mitre ... does not come into question till the eleventh century. Indeed, neither in the eleventh century nor at the present time can it be said to constitute an episcopal sign of office, properly speaking" (L. Duchesne, Christian Worship: Its Origin and Evolution [London, 1919], p. 398). See also H. Norris, Church Vestments (London, 1949), pp. 95-107.

49. For comment on the early use of ring and staff, see Duchesne, pp. 397-98.

50. This emphasizes again the right of the bishop to pre-eminence in his own diocese, in accordance with the teachings of Vatican II.

cathedram, Consecrator principalis deducit Ordinatum ad cathedram (vel ad locum ei paratum), Episcopis consecrantibus eos sequentibus.

34. Demum Ordinatus, deposito baculo, accipit a Consecratore principali et ab omnibus Episcopis osculum pacis.

35. Post traditionem baculi usque ad finem Ordinationis cani potest:

Ant. Euntes in mundum, alleluia, docete omnes gentes, alleluia.

Psalmus 95

Repetitur antiphona, et idem fit post binos versus psalmi.

Non dicitur Gloria Patri.

Psalmus tamen abrumpitur et repetitur antiphona, postquam omnes osculum pacis sibi dederunt.

Cani potest etiam alius cantus aptus.

place at the bishop's chair, the principal consecrator leads the newly ordained bishop to the chair or to a place prepared for him, and the consecrating bishops follow them.

34. The newly ordained then sets aside his staff and receives the kiss of peace from the principal consecrator and all the other bishops.

35. After the presentation of the staff, and until the end of the ordination rite, the following may be sung:

Ant. Alleluia, go and teach all people my Gospel, alleluia,⁵¹ with Psalm 96.⁵²

The antiphon is repeated after every two verses.

Glory to the Father is not said.

The psalm is interrupted and the antiphon repeated when all have given the kiss of peace to the new bishop.

Any other appropriate song may be sung.

51. This serves as a final reminder that the apostolic commission involves being sent, hence we may infer that in one sense no episcopal ordination can ever be relative. See Note 16.

52. The difference in the numbering of the psalm is because the official text uses the Vulgate.

De liturgia eucharistica

36. Omnia fiunt secundum Ordinem concelebrationis Missae pontificalis, praeter ea quae sequuntur.

37. Quando adhibetur Canon Romanus, dicitur Hanc igitur proprium:

Hanc igitur oblationem servitutis nostrae, sed et cunctae familiae tuae, quam tibi offerimus etiam pro hoc famulo tuo, quem ad Episcopatus ordinem promovere dignatus es, quaesumus, Domine, ut placatus accipias, et propitius in eo tua dona custodias, ut, quod divino munere consecutus est, divinis effectibus exsequatur. Per Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen.

38. Expleta oratione post communionem, canitur hymnus Te Deum laudamus, vel alius hymnus huic respondens, iuxta locorum consuetudines. Interim Ordinatus ducitur a Consecrantibus per ecclesiam, et omnibus benedicit.

Finito hymno, Ordinatus, stans ad altare vel ad cathedram cum mitra et baculo, potest populum breviter alloqui.

39. Loco benedictionis consuetae,

THE LITURGY OF THE EUCHARIST

36. The Order for the concelebration of pontifical Mass is followed, with these exceptions:

37. In Eucharistic Prayer I, the special form of Father, accept this offering is said:⁵³

Father, accept this offering from your whole family

and from the one chosen for the order of bishops.

Protect the gifts you have given him,

and let him yield a harvest worthy of you.

[Through Christ our Lord. Amen.]

38. At the conclusion of the prayer after communion, the hymn Te Deum is sung, or another hymn similar to it, depending on local custom. Meanwhile the newly ordained bishop is led by the consecrating bishops through the church, and he blesses the congregation.

After the hymn, the new bishop may stand at the altar or at the chair with staff and miter and address the people briefly.

39. The following blessing may be

53. In the former rite there was no proper Hanc igitur, but the rubric required that the one in the canon be said by the new bishop alone.

dici potest benedictio quae sequitur.

Si Ordinatus est celebrans principalis, dicit:

Deus, qui populis tuis indulgendo consulis et amore dominaris, da Spiritum sapientiae quibus tradidisti regimen disciplinae, ut de profectu sanctarum ovium fiant gaudia aeterna pastorum.

Omnes:

Amen.

Et qui dierum nostrorum numerum temporumque mensuras maiestatis tuae potestate dispensas, propitius ad humilitatis nostrae respice servitutum et pacis tuae abundantiam temporibus nostris praetendens perfectam.

Omnes:

Amen.

Collatis quoque in me per gratiam tuam propitiare muneribus et quem fecisti gradu episcopali sublimem, fac operum perfectione tibi placentem^e atque in eum affectum

used in place of the usual blessing.⁵⁴

If the newly ordained bishop is the principal celebrant, he says:

Lord God,
you care for your people with kindness,

you rule them with love.

Give your Spirit of wisdom
to the bishops you have made teachers and pastors.

By advancing in holiness
may the flock become the eternal
joy of the shepherds.

R. Amen.

Lord God,
by your power you allot us
the number of our days and the
measure of our years.

Look favorably upon the service we
perform for you,
and give true, lasting peace in
our time.

R. Amen.

Lord God,
now that you have raised me to the
order of bishops,
may I please you in the performance
of my office.

54. In the former rite the new bishop always pronounced the blessing. It is now the prerogative of the principal celebrant.

dirige cor plebis et praesulis, ut
nec pastori oboedientia gregis nec
gregi desit umquam cura pastoris.

Omnes:

Amen.

Et statim addere potest:

Et benedictio Dei omnipotentis,
Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sanc-
ti, descendat super vos et maneat
semper.

Omnes:

Amen.

Si Consecrator principalis prae-
sidet liturgiae eucharisticae, di-
cit:

Benedicat tibi Dominus custodi-
ensque te, sicut te voluit super
populum suum constituere pontifi-
cem, ita in praesenti saeculo fe-
licem et aeternae felicitatis fa-
ciat te esse consortem.

Omnes:

Amen.

Clerum ac populum, quem sua vo-
luit opitulatione congregari, sua
dispensatione et tua administrati-
one per diuturna tempora faciat
feliciter gubernari.

Omnes:

Amen.

Unite the hearts of people and
bishop,
so that the shepherd may not be
without the support of his flock,
or the flock without the loving
concern of its shepherd.

R. Amen.

May almighty God bless you,
the Father, and the Son, and the
Holy Spirit.

R. Amen.

If the principal consecrator
presides over the eucharistic li-
turgy, he says:

May the Lord bless and keep you,
as he chose to make you a bishop
for his people.

May you know happiness in this
present life
and share unending joy.

R. Amen.

The Lord has gathered his people
and clergy in unity.

By his care and your stewardship
may they be governed happily for
many years.

R. Amen.

Quatenus divinis monitus parentes, adversitatibus carentes, bonis omnibus exuberantes, tuo ministerio fide obsequentes et in praesenti saeculo pacis tranquillitate fruantur et tecum aeternorum civium consortio potiri mereantur.

Omnes:

Amen.

Et statim addere potest:

Et benedictio Dei omnipotentis, Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, descendat super vos et maneat semper.

Omnes:

Amen.

40. Data benedictione, omnes processionaliter per ecclesiam revertuntur in sacristiam; et recedunt in pace.

May they be obedient to God's law,
free from hardships,
rich in every blessing,
and loyally assist you in your
ministry.

May they be blessed with peace and
calm in this life
and come to share with you
the fellowship of the citizens of
heaven.

R. Amen.

May almighty God bless you,
the Father, and the Son, and the
Holy Spirit.

R. Amen.

40. After the blessing, all leave
in procession through the church
to the sacristy and go their way
in peace.

De benedictione insignium
pontificalium

Benedictio anuli, baculi pastoralis, mitrae tempore opportuno, ante Ordinationem Episcopi, peragi potest hoc modo:

V. Adiutorium nostrum in nomine Domini.

R. Qui fecit caelum et terram.

V. Dominus vobiscum.

R. Et cum spiritu tuo.

Oremus.

Omnipotens sempiterne Deus, benedic haec (hoc) muneri pastoralis et pontificalis honoris insignia (insigne), ut, qui ea (id) genuerit, praemium dispensationis sibi creditae cum Christo, summo Sacerdote et bono Pastore, in aeterna vita percipiat. Per Christum Dominum nostrum.

R. Amen.

Et aspergantur aqua benedicta.

THE BLESSING OF
PONTIFICAL INSIGNIA⁵⁵

The pastoral ring, staff, and miter may be blessed at a convenient time prior to the ordination of the bishop.

V. Our help is in the name of the Lord.

R. The Lord who made heaven and earth.

V. The Lord be with you.

R. And also with you.

Let us pray.

Almighty, eternal God, bless these symbols (this symbol) of the pastoral office and the pontifical dignity.

May the one who uses them (it) receive the reward of his faithfulness

and enter into eternal life with Christ, the High Priest and Good Shepherd.

We ask this through Christ our Lord.

R. Amen.

They are sprinkled with holy water.

55. The new rite has only one prayer for all the insignia rather than separate prayers which attempt to give a special meaning to each of them, as in the former rite. See Rubric 7, p. 247.

READINGS FOR THE ORDINATION MASSES⁵⁶

Some of these readings are intended for a particular use. The others may be used at any ordination.

According to liturgical tradition, the Old Testament is not read during the Easter season;⁵⁷ a preference is given, in the gospel, to the readings from John.

I. OLD TESTAMENT READING

1. Numbers 3:5-10a Gather the tribe of Levi so that they can serve Aaron the priest. [For deacons]
2. Numbers 11:11b-12, 14-17, 24-25a I will give them your spirit so that they may share with you in the burden of this people. [For priests]
3. Isaiah 61:1-3a The Lord has anointed me and sent me to bring Good News to the poor and to give them the oil of gladness. [For bishops and priests]
4. Jeremiah 1:4-9 You will go to all the places to which I will send you.

II. NEW TESTAMENT READING

5. Acts 6:1-7a They chose seven men filled with the Holy Spirit. [For deacons]
6. Acts 8:26-40 Beginning with this text of scripture he explained the Good News of Jesus to him. [For deacons]
7. Acts 10:37-43 We are witnesses to everything Jesus did in the countryside around Judea and in Jerusalem.
8. Acts 20:17-18a, 28-32, 36 Keep watch for yourselves and for all the flock of which the Holy Spirit has made you overseers⁵⁸ to govern the Church of God. [For bishops and priests]
9. Romans 12:4-8 Our gifts differ according to the grace given to each of us.

56. This section is from the authorized English translation. Any major difference in the Latin text will be noted.

57. The rubric fails to mention that a lesson from Acts is the normal substitute.

58. In the Latin text, episcopos.

10. 2 Corinthians 4:1-2, 5-7 We are teaching Jesus Christ, but we are your servants for Jesus' sake.
11. 2 Corinthians 5:14-20 He gave us the ministry of reconciliation.
12. Ephesians 4:1-7, 11-13 Unity in the work of service, building up the body of Christ.⁵⁹
13. 1 Timothy 3:8-13 They must be conscientious believers in the mystery of faith. [For deacons]
14. 1 Timothy 4:12-16 Do not neglect the spiritual gift given you when the elders laid hands on you.
or: 1 Timothy 4:12b-16. [For bishops]
15. 2 Timothy 1:6-14 Rekindle the gift that God gave you when I laid my hands on you. [For bishops]
16. Hebrews 5:1-10 Christ was acclaimed by God a high priest of the order of Melchizedek.
17. 1 Peter 4:7b-11 As good stewards be responsible for the different graces of God.
18. 1 Peter 5:1-4 Be shepherds of the flock of God which is entrusted to you.

III. GOSPEL

19. Matthew 5:13-16 You are the light of the world.
20. Matthew 9:35-38 Ask the Lord of the harvest to send laborers to the harvest.
21. Matthew 10:1-5a Proclaim that the kingdom of God is at hand.⁶⁰
22. Matthew 20:25-28 Anyone among you who wishes to be first must be your servant.
23. Luke 10:1-9 The harvest is rich but the laborers are few.

59. The Latin text simply quotes: In opus ministerii, in aedificationem corporis Christi. The mention of unity is an interpolation by the English language committee to illustrate the fuller theme of the passage.

60. This explanatory verse is actually v. 7 of the chapter, and so is not read at all. The Latin text also renders the Gk. correctly as "the kingdom of heaven" (regnum caelorum).

24. Luke 12:35-44 Happy those servants whom the master finds awake when he comes.⁶¹
25. Luke 22:14-20, 24-30 Do this in memory of me. I come among you as one who serves.⁶²
26. John 10:11-16 The good shepherd lays down his life for his sheep.
27. John 12:24-26 If anyone serves me, he must follow me.
28. John 15:9-17 I shall not call you servants; you are my friends.
29. John 17:6, 14-19 For them I consecrate myself so that they too may be consecrated in truth.
30. John 20:19-23 As the Father has sent me, I send you: Receive the Holy Spirit.
31. John 21:15-17 Feed my lambs, feed my sheep.
-

61. The importance of this text for an ordination during Advent should not be overlooked by the preacher as it provides a splendid opportunity to deal with the eschatological dimensions of Christian ministry.

62. This is the only specifically Eucharistic text employed, and it is not restricted to the ordinations of priests and bishops.

Two primary observations should be made about the new Roman rite, and under those rubrics all other comments may follow. First, the rite represents an attempt to incorporate the theological principles of Lumen Gentium's teaching about the episcopacy as fully and as faithfully as possible within a liturgical experience. Secondly, the revisers of the rite have produced a liturgy that is free from ambiguity and verbal and symbolic clutter, so that the service moves with precision and certainty. We will look first at the theological affirmations contained in the rite, and then at some aspects of the rite itself as a liturgical witness to what the Church seeks to teach about the meaning of the episcopal office.

Theological Principles

In the last chapter (pp. 161-63) I constructed an unofficial "authoritative definition" of episcopacy based on the statements of Lumen Gentium and suggested that it might be used as a guide for examining the rite's theological content. That I now propose to do.

1. The episcopacy is a servant ministry instituted by Christ in a hierarchically structured society. These points are all made in the suggested homily (pp. 251-55). "Our Lord Jesus Christ ... sent twelve apostles into the world [who] passed on the gift of the Holy Spirit which they themselves had received from Christ." "The title of bishop is one not of honor but of function, and therefore a bishop should strive to serve rather than to rule." "As a father and a brother, love all those whom God places in your care. Love the priests and deacons who share with you in the ministry of Christ." The homily also reminds the bishop of his place in the college of bishops, and the Examination makes clear that the maintenance of his position in the hierarchy involves "obedience to the successor of the apostle Peter." The servant nature of the office is also emphasized in the last four questions of the Examination. The continued use of the image of shepherd and flock reinforces the hierarchical character of the Church without denying the importance of reciprocity. This is well illustrated in the last part of the prayers for blessing that are used when the newly ordained bishop gives the blessing (p. 273): "Unite the hearts of people and bishop, so that the shepherd may not be without the support of his flock, or the flock without the loving concern of its shepherd."

2. Together with the successor of Peter and never without him, they, by virtue of sacramental consecration, are incorporated into a college and share with him in the government of the Church. The homily reminds the bishop-elect that he is incorporated into the college of bishops and that as a result he is to be concerned with the welfare of all the churches. The homily says nothing about the bishop's relation to the pope. One must look to the Examination for that to be made clear. The fourth question ("Are you resolved to build up the Church as the body of Christ and to remain united to it within the order of bishops under the authority of the successor of the apostle Peter?") is intended to remind us that a bishop has "validity" only and in so far as he functions within the episcopal college as a responsible member. The building up of the Church can only be done in cooperation with the entire episcopate under its only legitimate head, the successor of Peter. In this way the bishop is not only the ordinary ruler in his own diocese, but he also shares in the government of the whole Church. The fifth question ("Are you resolved to be faithful in your obedience to the successor of the apostle Peter?") guarantees that "never without him" will the bishop exercise legitimate authority within both diocese and college.

3. As members of the episcopal college they exemplify the diversity of the Catholic Church, and in their dioceses they are symbolic of its unity. This principle is demonstrated more by what is done and by whom in the service, rather than anything specifically stated in formula. I have already quoted passages which refer to the bishop's incorporation into the episcopal college, and, by implication, that means

that he is representative of the whole Church in his diocese, although the point is not made in so many words. The formula that is most expressive of diversity is the new presentation: "Most Reverend Father, the Church of N. asks you to ordain this priest N.N. for service as bishop" (p. 250). The former presentation (and the one still employed when a non-residential bishop is being ordained) has "...our holy mother the Catholic Church asks you..." The new form illustrates that the Church receives its episcopate from the diversity of the Churches (dioceses) that compose it. It recognizes the legitimate independence of the dioceses in their own right according to the principles set forth in Chapter II of Christus Dominus. The fact that the dioceses do not actually make the choice of their own bishops in the Roman church cuts radically into the significance of the presentation, but the liturgy at least points in the right direction. It is important to note also that the presentation is now made by a presbyter of the diocese and not by a bishop.

4. Bishops act in the person of Christ and undertake his role as Teacher, Shepherd, and High Priest. The second paragraph of the homily (which is essentially a paraphrase of Lumen Gentium 21) elaborates the ways in which Christ himself acts in the person of the bishop, and the conclusion of the homily is a reminder that it is Jesus Christ "whose role of Teacher, Priest, and Shepherd you undertake." This is made possible because, according to the consecratory prayer, the bishop receives the same Spirit that was given to Jesus by the Father (pp. 264-65).

5. As teachers, in matters of faith and morals, they speak in

the name of Christ, and the faithful are to accept this teaching with a religious assent of soul... In the homily the faithful are told that "through the bishop's wisdom and prudence, Christ guides you in your earthly pilgrimage toward eternal happiness," and that "he has been entrusted with the task of witnessing to the truth of the Gospel and fostering a spirit of justice and holiness." The importance of being guided by the bishop is underscored by the words of Christ: "Whoever listens to you listens to me; whoever rejects you rejects me..." The bishop, in the portion of the homily directed to him, is told that he is to "correct error with unfailing patience and teaching." There is a dialogical aspect to the episcopal ministry in that the bishop is "to listen willingly" to what the faithful have to say. At the presentation of the Gospels, the bishop is told to "preach the word of God with unfailing patience and sound teaching." And the final prayers before the blessing asks God to "give your Spirit of wisdom to the bishops you have made teachers..."

6. ...for the infallibility promised to the Church resides with them when with the pope they exercise the supreme teaching authority. It is difficult to see how this point is made in the rite, since the pope is only mentioned in the two questions already cited in the Examination and in the Litany. The rite seems to be more concerned to defend the teaching office of the bishop per se than it is to recognize papal pre-eminence in the magisterium. Indeed, if the rite is looked at as a commentary of Lumen Gentium (or at least as a liturgical reflection upon it, which, on the basis of the homily alone, it is clearly intended to

be), then we were justified in our criticism of the Constitution's section on the relation of the pope to the bishops in the teaching office as "an excursus on papal infallibility" (p. 145), because none of it finds a place in the ordination service. "The authority of the successor of the apostle Peter" is acknowledged in the Examination, but one must go to the Council documents to discover how that authority relates to the teaching office of the bishop as an individual or as a member of the episcopal college. It would appear that the authors of the liturgy also saw much of Lumen Gentium 25 as an unnatural intrusion into the orderly development of a theology of episcopal ministry. In any event, they were concerned to emphasize the independent, privileged position of the bishop as teacher in his diocese. The difference in perspective is seen by comparing the third question of the present Examination with the third question in the former rite. The present question asks, "Are you resolved to maintain the deposit of faith, entire and incorrupt, as handed down by the apostles and professed by the Church everywhere and at all times?" The responsibility is clearly seen to be that of the bishop, and his teaching rests upon that deposit of faith which has always been with the Church and which he guards by virtue of his inclusion in the episcopal college which has succeeded to the apostolic college. The former rite asked, "Are you willing to accept with reverence, teach, and observe the traditions of the orthodox Fathers, and the decretals and constitutions of the Holy Apostolic See?" (Vis traditiones orthodoxorum Patrum ac decretales Sanctae et Apostolicae Sedis constitutiones veneranter suscipere, docere ac servare?)

This question sees the bishop, not as independent, responsible, and apostolic, but rather as a passive and reverent recipient of the teaching and acts of others in a more privileged state than his, and his responsibility is limited to enforcement. The new question recognizes that even "the traditions of the orthodox Fathers and the decretals and constitutions of the Holy Apostolic See" can add nothing new to the original deposit of faith which is entrusted to the entire episcopate. The new rite not only refrains from making any explicit connection between the episcopal teaching office and the papal magisterium; it also, in the sixth question of the Examination, implies that governing and teaching must be shared with the diocesan college: "Are you resolved as a devoted father to sustain the people of God and to guide them in the way of salvation in cooperation with the priests and deacons who share your ministry?" It must be said, then, that the Pontifical presents the image of a much more independent teaching bishop than is found in the 25th article of Lumen Gentium.

7. They govern in their particular dioceses as vicars of Christ and not as representatives of the pope, although they are subject to the full, supreme, and universal power of the Pontiff and must be in hierarchical communion with him. The entire homily makes clear the vicariate of the bishop in the place and person of Christ, and the repeated use of the shepherd and flock image reinforces the episcopal identity as one which relates to the Good Shepherd. The formula at the presentation of the pastoral staff states that "the Holy Spirit has appointed you to shepherd the Church of God" (see Acts 20:28).

Even if the ordination is absolute rather than relative, the intention hopefully is that the bishop will be assigned an area of responsibility that is comparable to a flock (university presidency, general of an order, oversight of a Vatican office), and that the onus Episcopatus would not be conferred as a purely honorific act, like the granting of a D.D.

The fourth question of the Examination is the first to mention the authority of the pope, and it does so in relation to hierarchical communion. The form of the question is instructive. The bishop is united to the Church within the order of bishops under the authority of the successor of Peter. The bishop is subject to the pope because the pope is the head of the episcopal college. There can be no college without the pope, but by the same reasoning there can be no pope without the college. It is only when that series of relationships has been clarified does the fifth question ask, "Are you resolved to be faithful in your obedience to the successor of the apostle Peter?" Once again it is necessary to look at the question as it appeared in the former rite to appreciate the change that has taken place. That question asked, "Are you willing in all things to be loyal, submissive, and obedient - in accordance with the Church's laws - to the blessed apostle Peter, to whom God gave the power to bind and loose, and to his vicar, our Holy Father, Pope N., and his successors the Roman Pontiffs?" (Vis beato Petro Apostolo, cui a Deo data est potestas ligandi ac solvendi, eiusque Vicario Domino nostro, Domino N. Papae N. suisque Successoribus, Romanis Pontificibus, fidem, subiectionem et obedientiam, secundum canonicam auctoritatem, per

omnia exhibere?) First, the power to bind and loose was not given exclusively to Peter, as the Hippolytean consecration prayer which is now used makes clear: "to loose every bond by the authority which you gave to your apostles." Secondly, the submission which is due to the pope as head of the college is not due to the law of the Church (secundum canonicam auctoritatem), but is de jure divino. The relation of bishop to college to pope is the same as that of apostle to apostolic college to Peter. The new question recognizes that the bishop is subject to the "full, supreme, and universal" power of the pope, but the rite is more concerned, in the spirit of Vatican II, to establish the right and independence of the bishop to govern within his diocese with a "proper, ordinary, and immediate power" that is bestowed by virtue of sacramental consecration and not mediated through the Holy See.

8. Through their sacramental consecration they possess the fullness of the sacrament of orders and so are responsible for the priestly ministry by conferring that sacrament in various degrees upon their helpers, the priests and deacons, and supervising their labors. We have seen (pp. 100-12) how the question of the sacramentality of episcopal consecration/ordination has been debated since the early middle ages. Vatican II put an end to that debate as far as the Roman church is concerned, and the new liturgy is designed to implement that decision. The rite itself is referred to as an ordination and not a consecration (p. 244). The first paragraph of the homily declares that the laying on of hands for episcopal service "confers the sacrament of orders in its fullness" (qua Ordinis sacramenti plenitudo confertur). We have seen in the

ordinals of CSI and the 1662 BCP how there is a tendency to blur the distinction between presbyters and bishops both in the Examination and the consecratory prayer. The new Roman rite is very explicit about the nature of what is conferred in each ordination. Candidates for the presbyterate are asked, "Are you resolved ... to discharge without fail the office of priesthood in the presbyteral order (munus Sacerdotii in gradu Presbyterorum) as conscientious fellow workers with the bishops in caring for the Lord's flock?" Only three other questions are asked, and they concern celebrating the holy mysteries, ministering the Word, and consecration of life. All the images of shepherding, governing, and of priesthood are reserved for the episcopal ordination rite. And, as we saw in our examination of the Hippolytean consecration prayer, it contains all the priestly images that we ordinarily associate with the work of the parish priest.

The difference is more easily perceived in the authorized Latin version than in the official English translation, because the Latin preserves the distinction between priest (sacerdos) and presbyter, something the committee was not permitted to do in its translation (see p. 245).

The last question of the Examination reminds the elect that he will have the "fullness of the priesthood" to execute. This is more than the Latin text actually says (summi sacerdotii munus explere), but it is certainly in keeping with the intent of the rest of the rite and the teaching of Vatican II. The English translation of Propitiare (p. 262) also reinforces the teaching of the Council in a way not necessarily warranted by the Latin. "...inclinato super hunc famulum tuum cornu

gratiae sacerdotalis" becomes "Anoint your servant with the fullness of priestly grace." The previously approved translation was content with "vessel of priestly grace." Surely it is the teaching of Lumen Gentium that is responsible for the change.

Except for the line in the consecratory prayer which lists one of the bishop's duties as that "to assign ministries" (distribuat munera), nothing is said in the service about the bishop's responsibility for ordination. This is in marked contrast to the way that function is singled out for mention by the other rites in this study. Such silence is understandable if the authority to ordain is seen as residing only in the bishop because he contains the fullness of the priesthood and therefore all ranks of ministry must derive from him. Ordination must have special mention in the other rites because they appear to be uncertain about who may have the right to ordain (as in the CSI use of presbyters at episcopal consecrations); therefore, because of tradition or whatever reason, for the sake of good order, they reserve ordination as an episcopal prerogative. It may not be too much of an oversimplification to say that, on the evidence of the rites alone, the Romans have an episcopacy so that they might have a priesthood; the other rites have an episcopacy so that there will be someone to do the work of ordaining.

The fraternal partnership that should exist between the bishop and his clergy, and the bishop's governing and supervising functions are emphasized in the homily (par. 2, 6) and the sixth question of the Examination.

9. The high priestly duty of sanctification extends to their manner of life and so they are called to be an influence for good. The homily is filled with examples of how the bishop is to relate for good to those with and for whom he is called to minister. He is to be concerned for justice and holiness, to listen to and encourage the faithful, to love the poor, infirm, strangers, and homeless, and to model his ministry after that of the Good Shepherd. He is to be not only shepherd but father and brother. The Examination refers to him as a "devoted father" (pius pater), and the one question which remains virtually unchanged across the centuries is that which speaks of the bishop's responsibility for showing "kindness and compassion in the name of the Lord to the poor and to strangers and to all who are in need." We tend to think of this as a diaconal function, but it is only so by way of delegation. If the bishop receives the fullness of order he then is the chief servant in the diocese and final responsibility for the work of the deacons is his. That is why the bishop wears the deacon's dalmatic as part of the full pontifical regalia. The first part of the final prayers at the blessing (when said by the new bishop) gives the bishop the divine example ("you care for your people with kindness, you rule them with love"), and it refers back to the theme of sanctification which is the purpose (among others) of episcopal ministry ("by advancing in holiness may the flock become the eternal joy of the shepherds").

The Liturgical Evidence

It is not sufficient simply to examine the text of the rite to compare what is said there with the theological statements to be found in Lumen Gentium. Liturgy teaches by what is done as well as by what is said, and so one must look to the rubrics to see the action envisioned by the authors and to imagine how that action might proceed as well as consider what the implications will be if the rubrics are silent at any point.¹

The first thing to be noted is that the liturgy is to be celebrated "when a large number of the faithful can attend" (Rub. 1), and the physical arrangements within the church are to be such that they will be able to see and hear what is taking place (Rub. 9b). The ordination is thus placed within the framework of the whole People of God whose baptismal priesthood finds a representative in the bishop. All the people are to respond to the reading of the papal mandate for ordination (Rub. 17), and not just the principal consecrator as formerly. Since the service is prefaced by the ordinary liturgy of the word (Rub. 11), there is no reason why lay persons cannot be employed in the reading of the lesson and the epistle and be in consequence more than spectators. It is to be regretted that lay persons are not also used at the presentation of the bishop-elect to the principal consecrator, since that would emphasize more clearly their participation in diocesan life.²

1. For a discussion of the relation of rubric to "nigric" (his term for the actual words used in a rite), see R. Panikkar, Worship and Secular Man (London, 1973), pp. 69-90.

2. Sacrosanctam Concilium (Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy) 14; L.G. 33

The second rubric is a recognition of the collegial nature of the episcopate when it says that "it is fitting (decet) for all the bishops present together with the principal consecrator to ordain the bishop-elect," and it goes in its wording a bit beyond the mandate of S.C. which said merely that all the bishops may (fieri licet) so participate (par. 76).

The collegial relationship that is to exist between the bishop and the presbytery of his diocese is exemplified in the fourth rubric which provides for concelebrating priests at the ordination mass, and in the sixteenth rubric which requires that he be presented by two priests from the diocese which he will serve. This concelebration, along with the new provision that, if it is in his own church, the new bishop may preside at the mass, is in accordance with the principles of S.C., and it applies them from the moment of his ordination.

...all should hold in very high esteem the liturgical life of the diocese which centers around the bishop, especially in his cathedral church. Let them be persuaded that the Church reveals herself most clearly when a full complement of God's holy people, united in prayer and in a common liturgical service (especially the Eucharist), exercise a thorough and active participation at the very altar where the bishop presides in the company of his priests and other assistants. (par. 41)

The vestments which the sixth rubric requires to be worn by the bishop-elect signify that it is in the episcopacy that the fullness of order is to be found. The bishop wears the dalmatic of the deacon, the chasuble of the priest, the stole, which is appropriate to both orders, and the pectoral cross, an emblem of the episcopal office. Although the rubric does not say so, the other bishops who concelebrate would be

likewise vested. The history of the dalmatic is a good illustration of the history of the theology of the source of orders, since it was originally a papal-episcopal vestment, and its use was granted to deacons as a sign of dignity and favor. It has over the centuries, however, become so associated with the diaconate that its episcopal origins tend to be forgotten.

Par. 34 of S.C. states that

The rites should be distinguished by a noble simplicity: they should be short, clear, and unencumbered by useless repetitions; they should be within the people's powers of comprehension, and normally should not require much explanation.

The new ordination rite has abided by this norm, and nowhere is it more evident than in the new form of the actual consecration and the presentation of the episcopal insignia. Comparisons with the former rite have been made in the notes, but certain observations should be made here.

The consecration rite has been placed after the gospel in the ordinary of the mass. This has traditionally been the place where the ordination of bishops occurred, but now all ordinations are to be done at that point. Ordination to the sacred ministry, in whatever order, is thus seen as a response to the gospel and to the call of God in Jesus Christ. The first paragraph of the homily, although it speaks of the commission of the apostles by Christ and the continuation of their work through the laying on of hands, does not emphasize as much as it might the reason for placing the ordination where it is in the service. Since the principal consecrator is free to adapt the homily, such an explanation might not be wholly out of place so that the total action will be

clearly perceived by the people.

Perhaps the least satisfactory aspect of the rite is the restriction it places upon the sermon as the climax to the liturgy of the word. That which I refer to as the "homily" is given no specific name in the rite. We are told that the principal consecrator "briefly addresses" (breviter alloquitur) the people (Rub. 18), and the next Latin rubric describes what is to happen post allocutionem. This "allocution" is placed not immediately after the gospel, but after the reading of the papal mandate for the ordination. That is not unacceptable within this liturgical context, since the call to office arises out of the gospel, and the presentation and the reading of the mandate locates the one to whom the call comes and to whom, then, the sermon should in part be addressed. Nor is it objectionable that the rubrics require that the subject of the address should be "the duties of a bishop" (de munere Episcopi). My first objection is that the "preacher" must be the principal consecrator. If the rubric required that the suggested homily be used invariably, that might be acceptable, since it becomes in effect the liturgical introduction to the Examination (although that would eliminate the sermon entirely). But it is not that, and is intended to have the character of a homily, because the principal consecrator is given the option of using the set form or one of his own composition. There is no guarantee that the Holy Spirit will oversee the efforts of principal consecrators who sincerely believe that they can improve on the set form. And some there will surely be. I believe that the option should be extended to allow for a preacher to be appointed by the chief consecrator in consultation with the bishop-elect,

a preacher with the gifts and graces necessary to relate the scripture that has been read to the demands of the episcopal burden. My second objection is that, while the Romans are the most generous in the choice of lessons for the service (see Appendix G), no opportunity is provided necessarily for any of those lessons to be related to the liturgical activity of which they are a part. S.C. says,

Since the sermon is part of the liturgical service, the preferred place for it is to be indicated even in the rubrics, as far as the nature of the rite will allow; and the ministry of preaching is to be fulfilled with exactitude and fidelity. The sermon, moreover, should draw its content mainly from scriptural and liturgical sources. Its character should be that of a proclamation of God's wonderful works in the history of salvation, that is, the mystery of Christ, which is ever made present and active within us, especially in the celebration of the liturgy. (par. 35.2)

This norm is hardly fulfilled in the new ordination rite. The reason for that may be the difficulty Romans have in distinguishing between preaching and teaching, an observation we have already made in Chapter 3 (pp. 144-45, 152-54). The suggested homily is a didactic vehicle, admirable for its concise summary of the teaching of Vatican II on the nature of the episcopal office, and it serves as an excellent introduction to the Examination, but it does not qualify as "the preaching of the word," when by that we mean making "the mystery of Christ ... present and active within us" through relating the word of God in scripture to the present moment in the lives of the hearers.

In the new rite the essential matter and form are isolated from each other and from any other actions which may detract from them as primary features, and they are isolated in such a way as to provide a

dramatic climax to the ordination. After the Litany, all stand except the bishop-elect who kneels before the principal consecrator. Hands are laid upon him in silence, first by the principal consecrator, then by the other bishops. In the previous rite, Accipe Spiritum Sanctum was said, thus confusing what was the essential form, which came later in the consecratory prayer. The new rite provides for the dignity and majesty of silence as the apostolic chain is being forged.¹ It is to be hoped that those responsible for the management of such services will appreciate fully that when properly executed the imposition will need no additions or flourishes (certainly not a choir in the background!). Neither should he exhort the bishops to move as quickly as possible, regardless of their number. Each bishop laying on both hands, one bishop at a time, would serve to emphasize the individuality that is joined to make a college, and certainly no more than three bishops at a time should lay on hands, thus avoiding the effect so often seen that the elect is being pressed to death. Once the imposition of hands is completed, then the book of the Gospels is placed above the head of the elect, signifying the source of his call, ministry, and authority. The consecratory prayer is said or sung by the principal consecrator with all the bishops joining in only for the essential form. The prayer is not interrupted by anointings or any other secondary matter. At the end of the prayer the bishops sit, thus signifying that that which is essential has been accomplished and that that which follows is only supplementary.

The emphasis on the anointing and the presentation of insignia has

1. "...at the proper times all should observe a reverent silence" (S.C. 30).

been reduced from the former usage (pp. 266-69). The gloves are omitted entirely, and the order in which the presentations occur has been altered. The anointing of the head follows the consecratory prayer, and the anointing of the hands is omitted. The chrism is a sign of the Spirit who has been invoked in the prayer, and because the bishop is ordained to shepherd and to rule, i.e., to exercise "headship," it is his head that most appropriately is anointed. The anointing of the hands would fall into that category which the Council called repetitious (S.C. 34), since that has reference to the power to offer sacrifice and to bless, a power already bestowed in presbyteral ordination (see pp. 266-67). Having been anointed with the Spirit, the bishop is then equipped with the "sword of the Spirit," the Gospels, which are the source of that deposit of faith the bishop has already promised to maintain. The ring is next given as a seal of fidelity. There has been a tendency in some liturgical exegesis to maintain that the ring is symbolic of the bishop's "marriage" to his diocese. Considering the number of divorces permitted by the Holy See through translations, that hardly seems to bear up under examination. Indeed, the formula of presentation identifies the Church as the bride of God (sponsam Dei), and so such exegesis might be guilty of advocating ecclesiastical polygamy. It is easy to see how such an interpretation was possible in the old rite where the staff was given first and then the ring. The new order clarifies the issue, and the fidelity which is spoken of is fidelity to the gospel which has just been delivered to the new bishop. It is by his faithfulness to that that he is able to protect the Church.

So far there has been a logical progression: anointing, presentation of the Gospels, presentation of the ring - corresponding to the gift of the Spirit, the gift of the Word, the gift of faith. But now comes the presentation of the miter. I have already commented on this in the notes (pp. 268-69), and need only say here that if the silence which surrounds the imposition of hands conveys a sense of awe, this particular silence may be one of embarrassment. It is difficult to see how the miter could be discarded because of what has become a very long history of its symbolic value for the episcopal dignity, although in the light of the abandonment of the papal tiara, it may now be possible to see the silence as a prelude to putting it on the shelf entirely. Its symbolism is one that has been forced on it by the usage of the centuries, and any effort to relate it to scriptural images are forced at best. It may still have a role to play in heraldry, but to it should be applied one of the principles laid down in S.C.:

...the liturgy is made up of unchangeable elements divinely instituted, and elements subject to change. The latter not only may but ought to be changed with the passing of time if features have by chance crept in which are less harmonious with the intimate nature of the liturgy, or if existing elements have grown less functional. (par. 21)

Just as the gloves have lost their place (which was last in the former rite), so may the miter come to lose its because it is "less harmonious with the intimate nature of the liturgy."

Finally, then, the pastoral staff is presented to the bishop, the sign of his jurisdiction in the Church as shepherd of the flock. The earlier insignia have been concerned with preparing the bishop for his

office (the intrusion of the miter being excepted); this sign shows that he is to exercise the office. The earlier signs related him to God by whom he is commissioned; this sign relates him to the people for whom he is commissioned.

The formal consecration being over, the clearly distinguished supplemental and secondary rites having been performed, the new bishop is then escorted to his chair and assumes his place as the shepherd of the flock. The kiss of peace from the other bishops is a sign of his reception by them into the episcopal college, and his office of high priesthood in the diocese is then immediately witnessed to (in most cases) by his service as chief-concelebrant in the ordination mass.

We may say in summary that in terms of text and rubrics the theological assertions of Lumen Gentium have found expression in a clear and forceful way, and that the new rite not only embodies them in word and action, but is also conceived and executed according to the best principles of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy (remembering, of course, the two exceptions I have mentioned).

THE ORDINATION (CONSECRATION)¹ OF BISHOPS
according to the proposed Ordinal of
The Church of Christ Uniting

THE PREFACE² TO THE ORDINAL

The Church of Christ Uniting believes that all ministry in the church is a gift of Jesus Christ, the chief minister, the great high priest of the entire people of God. All members of the church are grafted into the people of God and commissioned for their ministry by baptism or by baptism-confirmation. With direct access to God they share in Christ's priesthood for all men. All share in the commission and authority of the whole church under Christ, who is servant, prophet, Lord, redeemer, and king.

Within the ministry of the whole people of God there is and has been from the beginning a particular ministry called by God and ordained by the church as his representative. In ordination the united church recognizes that the call to a man or woman³ is of God, prays that the one to be ordained will continue to receive the gifts of the Spirit, believes that God gives grace appropriate to the office, accepts and authorizes this ministry in and for his church.

In this ordinal the united church intends to continue the historic ministry of those ordained offices - Presbyters, Bishops, and Deacons - which has been given to the church from earliest times and which has come down to us through the uniting churches.⁴ The functions and responsibilities of these orders in the united church are defined in the

1. This is an obvious attempt to placate (hardly reconcile) the different theological opinions about the source of the order of bishops. The section on "The Ministry of Bishops" in A Plan of Union (pp. 49-53) uses only the term "consecration." The text of the rite is from A Plan of Union for the Church of Christ Uniting (Princeton, N.J., 1970), pp. 90-91, 96-99.

2. See CSI, n. 1.

3. This is the only indication that orders are open to both sexes.

4. See CSI, n. 2.

Plan of Union. (See Chapter VII "To Be Ministers of Christ," an indispensable companion document to this ordinal.)

It will be noted that these services are set in the sequence of Presbyters, Bishops, and Deacons. The same series is adopted in the plan of union. This is done with a definite intention to avoid the implication that the different offices are simply ascending steps in a hierarchy.⁵ This sequence seeks to convey the authenticity of each office of the ordained ministry and to allow creative insights into the interrelationships among these offices within the total ministry of the church.

Ordination will take place within a service of the Word and the Lord's Supper, celebrated by a worshiping congregation joined by representatives of the wider church including lay people. Within the service, such as *An Order of Worship for the Proclamation of the Word of God and the Celebration of the Lord's Supper*, the act of ordination follows the Proclamation of the Word of God, particularly after the sermon. After ordination the newly ordained Presbyter, Bishop, or Deacon shall take an appropriate part in the celebration of the Eucharist.

Representatives of all offices of the ministry, including the laity, shall participate in the laying on of hands, thus signifying that ordination is an act of the whole church. To symbolize the oneness of the church and the collegiality of the episcopate at least three Bishops shall participate in the laying on of hands in the ordination (consecration) of a Bishop.⁶

5. Compare this, however, with the following statements from A Plan of Union: "In accepting and maintaining the historic episcopate, the Church of Christ Uniting neither implies, excludes, nor requires any theory or doctrine of the episcopate which goes beyond what is stated in this plan" (p. 49), and, "...within the whole people of God, the bishop personifies the fullness of the priestly ministry of Christ" (p. 52).

6. This paragraph attempts a compromise between diverse theologies of ordination without any real reconciliation being accomplished.

For the Scripture readings it is assumed that lay persons will read certain lessons.⁷ The Old Testament lesson, Psalm (optional), Epistle, and Gospel may be selected from the following list, or other appropriate passages.⁸

	Presbyter	Bishop	Deacon
Old T. Lesson	Isaiah 6 Isaiah 61:1-6a Ezekiel 33:1-9 Psalm 99	Ezekiel 34:11-16 Psalm 43 Psalm 122 Psalm 132	Isaiah 42:1-9 Psalm 84
Epistle	Acts 20:17-35 Romans 12:1-12 II Corinthians 4:1-18 Ephesians 4:7-16 Titus 1:1-9 I Peter 5:1-11	Acts 20:17-35 I Timothy 3:1-7 II Timothy 4:1-5	Acts 6:2-7 Romans 12:1-12 Ephesians 5:15,17, 20-21 Ephesians 6:10-18 I Timothy 3:8-13
Gospel	Matthew 28:18-20 John 10:1-16 John 20:19-23	Matthew 28:18-20 John 20:19-23 John 21:15-17	Mark 10:35-45 Luke 12:35-38 Matthew 10:24-25a

The examination of the appropriate credentials and the certification of each ordinand will be handled by an appropriate procedure before the service and only reported at the time of the Presentation.

The giving of a Bible and some other appropriate symbol of each office, if desired, may be done in the service after the ordination prayer. While we recognize the importance of this part of the service, we also realize the need for creative thinking about those symbols which will signify the functions of the offices to the modern world.

7. Which lessons are not specified, but current liturgical practice would reserve both the Old Testament and Epistle to lay persons, a deacon reading the Gospel.

8. A commentary on the lections in all the rites will be found in the last section of this chapter.

THE ORDINATION (CONSECRATION) OF BISHOPS

Within the service of the Word and the Lord's Supper, the act of ordination begins after the sermon, as in An Order of Worship, pages 11-20.

THE PRESENTATION⁹

The Bishop-elect is presented to the Bishop presiding by three Presbyters of the district or region to which he is appointed, and one of the Presbyters says,

Bishop, we present to you this godly and well-learned person to be consecrated Bishop.

The Bishop presiding says,

Let the authorization of election and appointment be read.

The person duly appointed reads the authorization, after which the Bishop presiding says,

Beloved, we intend, God willing, this day to consecrate this person Bishop. You have heard that he has been chosen for this office by those who have authority from the church to do so. We now ask you to declare your assent.

We are not sufficient of ourselves; our sufficiency is from God. Do you trust that this person is, by God's grace, worthy to be consecrated?

The people answer,

We do so trust. Glory be to God.

The Bishop presiding says,

Let us pray.

Almighty God, giver of all good things, by your one Spirit you have appointed a diversity of ministries in your church. Look in mercy upon your servant now to be set apart for the office of Bishop, and so replenish him with the truth of your Gospel, adorn him with innocence of life, and fill him with the power of your Holy Spirit, that both by word and deed he may serve you faithfully and joyously, seeking first your Kingdom in the building-up and well-governing of your church; through

9. This section should be compared with the Presentation in CSI and the annotations made there. Differences between the two are insignificant.

Jesus Christ our Lord, who lives and reigns with you and the Holy Spirit, ever one God, world without end. Amen.

THE EXAMINATION

The Bishop-elect stands before the Bishop presiding, who says,
In the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, the head of the church, we are met together here to consecrate you to the office of Bishop. As a Bishop in the Church of God you are called to manifest and set forward the unity and continuity of the church at all times and places. The title of Bishop derives not from his rank but from his duty, and it is the part of the Bishop to serve rather than to rule.¹⁰ A Bishop is called to be a pioneer in mission, a healer of divisions among Christians, a guardian of the truth of faith and the purity of worship, a pastor to pastors, and a wise administrator of the church's organized work and life. A Bishop is called to lead God's people in worship, in celebration of the sacraments, in the ordination of ministers, and in the mission of the church, to be a preacher and teacher of the Gospel, and a guide and overseer of the church's common life. We believe that it is God who gives you grace and authority for the office to which you are called.¹¹
We therefore ask you:

Do you trust that you are truly called to the office of Bishop in Christ's Church?

I DO.

Will you take care that the church obeys our Lord's command to go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit?

I WILL, GOD BEING MY HELPER.

Will you as a shepherd in the church of Christ labor that his sheep may be one flock and that there be one fold?

10. Compare this with Par. 4 of the homily in RP (pp. 253-54): "The title of bishop is not one of honor but of function, and therefore a bishop should strive to serve rather than to rule."

11. The first sentence of the introduction to the Examination is based on CSI. Its content is a summary of pars. 69-79 in APU.

I WILL, BY GOD'S HELP.

Will you maintain the faith of the church and take care that it is set forth in a living way both in the church and the world?

I WILL, GOD BEING MY HELPER.

Will you be faithful in seeking,¹² ordaining, and sending others to minister in Christ's name?

I WILL, THE LORD BEING MY HELPER.

Will you be diligent to see that the worship of the people committed to your charge will be worthy of God's majesty and love?

I WILL, BY GOD'S HELP.

Will you exercise the fulness of your priestly ministry so that the people of God may offer themselves in union with Christ's perfect offering of Himself to God?¹³

I WILL, GOD BEING MY HELPER.

Will you be gentle to all who need your help, upholding the order of this church and administering its discipline in accordance with God's Word and justice and mercy?¹⁴

I WILL, BY GOD'S HELP.

Do you promise to perform the duties of your office in accordance with the constitution of this church?

I DO SO PROMISE, WITH THE HELP OF GOD.

May God our Father, who has given you the will to desire and promise these things, grant you also grace to perform them, that his work which he has begun in you may be brought to fulfillment, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

12. This question, adapted from BCP 1662, by the inclusion of "seeking" implies that the bishop has a special responsibility for fostering church vocations.

13. See Par. 4 of the Preface and n. 5.

14. This question fuses two traditional BCP questions - the one concerning aid to the needy and the one concerning the administration of discipline. The effect is to imply that the needy are most helped when the bishop is administering the Church's discipline!

THE CONSECRATION¹⁵

The Bishop-elect kneels, and the Bishops, Presbyters, Deacons and representatives of the laity who are to lay on hands stand around him.¹⁶

A hymn invoking the Holy Spirit is sung or said. The Bishop presiding then says,

Let us pray.

We give thanks to you, O God most high, for the reconciliation of the world unto yourself through your well-beloved Son Jesus Christ. By his coming, by his life, ministry, death, and resurrection, you poured out your Spirit, giving gifts to your people making some apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors and teachers, for the work of the ministry and the building up of the body of Christ, the church.

Here the Bishop presiding, with the Bishops, Presbyters, and others appointed to participate with him, shall join in laying their hands upon the head of the Bishop-elect, while the Bishop presiding says, Send forth your Holy Spirit upon your servant, N., whom we, in your name and in obedience to your most blessed will, do now ordain Bishop in your church. Give him grace, we pray you, to be a faithful ambassador of Christ to the world, to offer with all your people spiritual sacrifices acceptable to you, to feed and govern your flock as a true shepherd, and to promote love and unity among your people. And this we ask through Jesus Christ our Lord, the great Shepherd of the sheep and Bishop of our souls, who lives and reigns with you, O Father, and the Holy Spirit throughout all ages, world without end.

The people join in saying,

Amen.

Those assisting in the act of consecration give the right hand of fellowship to the new bishop.¹⁷

Here, if desired, he may be given an appropriate symbol of the epis-

15. Compare with CSI and its annotations.

16. See Par. 6 of the Preface.

17. See CSI, n. 4.

copal office.¹⁸

The Doxology is sung by the congregation, and the service of the Lord's Supper is resumed with the Nicene Creed (An Order of Worship, p. 22).¹⁹

18. See the last paragraph of the Preface.

19. The use of the Creed after the ordination is unique. The Creed is usually employed as guaranteeing orthodox teaching prior to the ordination.

The Church of Christ Uniting represents the efforts of nine denominations in the United States working since 1960 to achieve organic union. The proposed ordinal which contains the consecration rite we are examining was submitted to the churches for study in 1970 in a document entitled A Plan of Union. It contains not only the ordinal but also a general outline of how the new structure is to be organized and a section on the meaning and function of the ministry. The ordinal is the result of the attempt to apply the principles agreed upon about the ordered Christian ministry within a liturgical context.

We have already seen in the rite of the Church of South India the result of such an earlier ecumenical discussion. That discussion involved Anglicans, British Methodists, Congregationalists, and Presbyterians. Only the Anglicans had an episcopal style of government, and it was their concept of the threefold orders of the ministry that was adopted in the new church. The other denominations had never claimed to have an episcopate in the "catholic" mold, and the function of the negotiations was to incorporate them into the new structure without

denying the validity of the orders current in their churches. They would also elect men from among themselves to be ordained bishops in the new church, and thus would achieve their representation in the episcopal college. Since those denominations had no episcopal history, the tendency was to follow Anglican precedents wherever possible. The situation facing ecumenists in the U.S.A. has been more complicated.

Of the nine denominations participating in the discussions, five have an episcopal polity. Four of those five are branches of Methodism, the largest being the ten million member United Methodist Church (the largest participating denomination as well), and three all-black denominations. The fifth body is the Episcopal Church, the representative of the Anglican communion in the United States. This has meant that the Anglicans could not appear on the scene as the "authority" on episcopacy, as they did in South India. American Methodism has always maintained that there are but two orders of the ministry, deacons and elders (presbyters), and that bishops are elders who are consecrated for the task of general superintendence.¹ Their bishops are presbyter-bishops, but they are consecrated according to the Ordinal of the 1662 BCP, thus demonstrating that there is nothing in that rite to contradict their theological position. Consequently, two views of episcopacy had to be reconciled with one another as well as with the Presbyterian and Congregational traditions before agreement could be reached on a ministry for COCU. The results are contained in the statements on ministry in A Plan of Union and the proposed ordination rites.

1. For a general overview of the American Methodist episcopate, see G. Moede, The Office of Bishop in Methodism (New York, 1964).

The preface to the ordinal (one of the Anglican traditions to be preserved) summarizes the major agreements. The first three paragraphs are a reflection of those principles which we have seen incorporated into the Accra document five years later. Ministry is understood as the gift of Jesus Christ, the chief minister and great high priest, to the entire Church through baptism. There is within that fellowship a representative ministry that is called by God and acts as his representative to the Church and as the Church's representative to the world. Like CSI, it maintains that the three orders come "from earliest times" and that they come through all the uniting churches.

It is in the fourth paragraph that one finds a radical alteration of traditional patterns. We are told that the services are arranged in the order of presbyter, bishop, deacon, "with a definite intention to avoid the implication that the different offices are simply ascending steps in a hierarchy." This implies, in contrast to the Roman teaching, that neither are they a descending order from the high priesthood of Christ to the fullness of priestly ministry in the bishop, to a presbyteral sharing in the sacerdotal office when ordained by the bishop. As noted in the rite (n. 5), this statement appears to be at variance with two statements made in A Plan of Union. The Plan says that "In accepting and maintaining the historic episcopate, the Church of Christ Uniting neither implies, excludes, nor requires any theory or doctrine of the episcopate which goes beyond what is stated in this plan." "To avoid the implication" that two of the orders are dependent upon the third for their exercise seems to be a process of exclusion of one major under-

standing of the meaning of the episcopate. And later the Plan says that "within the whole people of God, the bishop personifies the fullness of the priestly ministry of Christ." Presbyters, then, must by implication represent an "un-full" priestly ministry. These contradictions appear to be the result of the Presbyterians insisting upon the recognition of the valid independence and apostolicity of presbyteral ordination, while the Episcopalians sought to insure the maintenance of the catholic doctrine concerning the priestly primacy of the bishop. The Plan tries to have it both ways with little success.

In the laying on of hands, however, COCU has been consistent at the point where we criticized CSI (p. 238). Because ministry is vested in the whole Church, the whole people of God, and the orders are representative of that ministry, the laying on of hands is performed for all orders by members of the laity as well as deacons, presbyters, and bishops. Such action is also consistent with the belief that each order is independent and authentic in its own right without dependence upon another and exists within the total ministry of the whole Church. It is further required that at the ordination of a bishop there shall be at least three bishops for the laying on of hands "to symbolize the oneness of the church and the collegiality of the episcopate." This requirement is obviously necessary if COCU and those Anglicans who would be a part of it intend to maintain that their episcopate is being continued within the historic succession as it has been understood to be conveyed by the Western church. But to say that it symbolizes the "oneness of the church" is to ascribe a priority to episcopacy that the Plan has already said it

does not intend to do. Once again a contradiction enters in the interest of attempting to resolve conflicting theologies.

The insistence upon the independence of the orders does away with the debate about the relation between presbyter and bishop. The orders are defined simply by what the Church declares to be proper to them, a right which is inherent in the Church as the baptized faithful who have primary responsibility for ministry. The ministry rises from below; it does not descend from above in the human order of things.

The introduction to the Examination is a summary of what the Plan details as "functions and responsibilities of bishops." They are pioneers in mission, pastoral overseers, teachers and prophets, administrative leaders, liturgical leaders, ordainers, and ecumenical leaders. The introduction also emphasizes that the bishop is to "set forward the unity and continuity of the church at all times and places." All of what might be called the traditional catholic burdens of the episcopate are included here, with a significant difference. The work the bishop does proceeds not from any apostolic mandate to his order, but is properly his because he has been incorporated in that order. The terms used frequently in the Plan that refer to the bishop are representative, symbol, and personification. "This office has been a principal symbol and agent of unity and continuity..." (p. 49); "The bishops together personify the continuity of the church's trusteeship of tradition..." (p. 49); "The bishop represents the unity ... of the church" (p. 52); "His sacramental ministry ... signifies that membership is not only in the local parish, but also in the whole church of Christ" (p. 52).

This means that the bishop is responsible and accountable to the whole church. The Plan (p. 51) makes this quite clear with reference to the episcopal teaching function. The section on the bishops as teachers and prophets could well serve as a précis of sections of Christus Dominus:

The bishop shall do all that is in his power to preach and to teach creatively the Christian faith as expressed in the Scriptures and in Tradition and to interpret prophetically what God is doing in the world. He bears responsibility for evoking creative thinking and action by his people. He should concern himself with such public issues as race relations, peace, poverty, housing, urban development, conservation and environmental control, population problems, justice, the rule of law in society, and the other contemporary problems of human relations to which Christ's mission should be directed.

But that definition must be balanced ^aagainst this earlier statement (p. 50):

The collegial role of the bishops may well take shape in specific pastoral and prophetic leadership, but no statement of the bishops as a college shall have official force as a rule of the united church unless it is approved by the Transitional or National Assembly.

It is here that the Methodist concept of episcopacy has had its influence on COCU. Modelled, in fact, after the United States Constitution, the constitution of American Methodism has seen the bishops as the executive arm of a church governed by a national assembly (the General Conference) and subject to the rulings of a Judicial Council on points of dispute. COCU bishops will be seen in much the same light; their authority will be subject to review, and much of their influence will be moral, based upon the symbolic nature of their office.

All of this is not, of course, reflected in the actual rite of

ordination, but it has been necessary to review what the Plan has said about episcopacy generally in order to understand why the rite and the preface have taken the shape they have. Further, the preface itself makes clear that the Plan is "an indispensable companion document to this ordinal."

The actual rite is greatly indebted to the South Indian predecessor, particularly for the introductory section. The Examination is quite altered in that CSI uses it to explain the intent of the ordination, and COCU uses it to enumerate the episcopal responsibilities. The questions are reduced in number and they reflect upon those burdens that have been specified in the introduction. The consecratory prayer is essentially the same.

What is conspicuous by its absence is any reference in the Examination to the holy scriptures as a norm for faith and practice. Likewise, there is no delivery of the Bible or Gospels to the bishop after his ordination. Immediately after the consecration we are told in the rubrics that "Here, if desired, he may be given an appropriate symbol of the episcopal office," and the preface comments that the giving of a Bible "and some other appropriate symbol" may be done at that point, but it adds the cautionary note that "While we recognize the importance of this part of the service, we also recognize the need for creative thinking about those symbols which will signify the functions of the offices to the modern world." It is difficult to understand why the traditional presentation of the Bible and the 1662 formula (revised) would have been permitted by Anglicans and Methodists alike to be omit-

ted, since it had been a part of both their consecration rites.

In summary we may say that the COCU rite for the ordination (consecration) of bishops attempts to satisfy the requirements for a "valid" ordination in that it includes examination and approval by the people, and prayer (epiclesis) with the laying on of hands, and it requires three bishops to participate in the imposition. It attempts to meet all the "catholic" criteria while at the same time mandating the use of others in the laying on of hands in order to provide for another theological interpretation. It clearly states what the functions and responsibility of a bishop should be. But when read in conjunction with the plan of union which is said in the preface to be "indispensable" to it, the bishop who emerges is clearly not that envisioned in Lumen Gentium. He is a sign of a prior reality which is the whole people of God; he does not in his person and through his ministry become a necessity for the presence of that reality in the world.

If COCU has become a dying issue, kept barely alive by the efforts of a few, as some maintain, this examination might give us reason to ask whether or not the cause of the demise is the attempt to soothe over historical and theological differences by an appeal to "creative thinking," without taking seriously enough the content of the differences. The question of authority again presents itself. None of the denominations involved have any adequate vehicle by which to update or reinterpret or promulgate doctrine, and such a merger requires doctrinal concession. Without concessions the proposed body will have to resort to the kind of official subterfuges we have seen in this rite which will

allow old and conflicting prejudices to continue, each finding justification in the same liturgies and formulae. If that happens, the implication is that no one really takes doctrine very seriously anyway, and it is organizational efficiency that should be the paramount concern.

In reading the next section, we should not forget that it was the same American Episcopalians who agreed to the COCU rite (and helped to write it) and who were at the same time involved in producing for their own use the one we shall now examine. One wonders how they could have taken both with equal seriousness. And the answer to that question may provide some hints as to the future of ecumenism in the United States, at least of ecumenism of the COCU variety.

THE ORDINATION OF A BISHOP
according to the Ordinal
of the Episcopal Church in
the United States of America*

PREFACE TO THE ORDINATION RITES¹

The Holy Scriptures and ancient Christian writers² make it clear that from the apostles' time, there have been different ministries within the Church. In particular, since the time of the New Testament, three distinct orders of ordained ministers have been characteristic of Christ's holy catholic Church. First, there is the order of bishops who carry on the apostolic work of leading, supervising, and uniting the Church. Secondly, associated with them are the presbyters, or ordained elders, in subsequent times generally known as priests. Together with the bishops, they take part in the governance of the Church, in the carrying out of its missionary and pastoral work, and in the preaching of the Word of God and administering his holy Sacraments. Thirdly, there are deacons who assist bishops and priests in all of this work. It is also a special responsibility of deacons to minister in Christ's name to the poor, the sick, the suffering, and the helpless.

The persons who are chosen and recognized by the Church as being called by God to the ordained ministry are admitted to these sacred orders by solemn prayer and the laying on of episcopal hands. It has been, and is, the intention and purpose of this Church to maintain and continue

*The rite reproduced here is from The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and Other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church (New York, 1979), pp. 510-23.

1. See CSI, n. 1.

2. This addition of "ancient Christian writers" adds the authority of tradition to that of scripture, and their witness is to "different ministries," a distinct alteration of the original Anglican preface.

these three orders;³ and for this purpose these services of ordination and consecration are appointed. No persons are allowed to exercise the offices of bishop, priest, or deacon in this Church unless they are so ordained, or have already received such ordination with the laying on of hands by bishops who are themselves duly qualified to confer Holy Orders.⁴

It is also recognized and affirmed that the threefold ministry is not the exclusive property of this portion of Christ's catholic Church, but is a gift from God for the nurture of his people and the proclamation of his Gospel everywhere. Accordingly, the manner of ordaining in this Church is to be such as has been, and is, most generally recognized by Christian people as suitable for the conferring of the sacred orders of bishop, priest, and deacon.

CONCERNING THE ORDINATION OF A BISHOP

In accordance with ancient custom, it is desirable, if possible, that bishops be ordained on Sundays⁵ and other feasts of our Lord or on the feasts of apostles or evangelists.

3. This represents an attempt to deal with possible Roman objections. It does not, of course, deal with the question of intention as posed by Leo XIII: do they intend to continue the orders as the Roman church understands them?

4. Cf. 1662 BCP: No man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawfull Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in the Church of England, or suffered to execute any of the said Functions, except he be called, tryed, examined, and admitted thereunto, according to the Form hereafter following, or hath had formerly Episcopall Consecration or Ordination. (Underlinings indicate 1662 additions to the 1549 original; after F.E. Brightman, The English Rite, vol. 2 /London, 1921/, p. 931).

5. See Brightman, p. 998. Also RP, 1st rubric, p. 244.

When a bishop is to be ordained, the Presiding Bishop of the Church, or a bishop appointed by the Presiding Bishop, presides and serves as chief consecrator. At least two other bishops serve as co-consecrators. Representatives of the presbyterate, diaconate, and laity of the diocese for which the new bishop is to be consecrated, are assigned appropriate duties in the service.⁶

From the beginning of the service until the Offertory, the chief consecrator presides from a chair placed close to the people, so that all may see and hear what is done. The other bishops, or a convenient number of them, sit to the right and left of the chief consecrator.⁷

The bishop-elect is vested in a rochet⁸ or alb, without stole, tippet, or other vesture distinctive of ecclesiastical or academic rank or order.

6. The attempt is here made to manifest the corporate life of the whole Church within the ordaining and eucharistic liturgy. Care is taken to provide for three bishops explicitly in the introductory rubrics, rather than by implication by designating who shall read which lessons, as formerly. Such would, in fact, be no longer possible, because the lesson and epistle would be read by lay persons, in keeping with the intent of this same rubric. A deacon or priest is required to read the Gospel.

7. See RP, Rubric 9, p. 248.

8. The rochet and chimere are the vestments traditionally associated with the Anglican episcopate. The rochet is a long white vestment with close-fitting sleeves^{at the wrists.} The chimere is best described as an academic dress gown without sleeves. It originated as the civil outdoor wear for bishops in winter (the tippet being used in summer). Like the miter, it has no significance in its own right, only those associations which have attached to it through use. It is the chimere that is referred to later in the service when, after the ordination, we are told in the rubric that "the new bishop is now vested according to the order of bishops."

~~Scarlet is now increasingly used for the chimere.~~ Scarlet is now increasingly used for the chimere.

When the bishop-elect is presented, his⁹ full name (designated by the symbol N.N.) is used. Thereafter, it is appropriate to refer to him only by the Christian name by which he wishes to be known.

At the Offertory, it is appropriate that the bread and wine be brought to the Altar by the family or friends of the newly ordained.

The family of the newly ordained may receive Communion before other members of the congregation. Opportunity is always given to the people to communicate.

THE ORDINATION OF A BISHOP

Hymns, psalms, and anthems may be sung during the entrance of the bishops and other ministers.

The People standing, the Bishop appointed says

Blessed be God: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

People And blessed be his kingdom, now and for ever. Amen.

In place of the above, from Easter Day through the Day of Pentecost
Bishop Alleluia. Christ is risen.

People The Lord is risen indeed. Alleluia.

In Lent and on other penitential occasions

Bishop Bless the Lord who forgives all our sins;

People His mercy endures for ever.

The Bishop then says

Almighty God, to you all hearts are open, all desires known, and from you

9. The use of italics (underscoring here) indicates that the Standing Liturgical Committee, at least, is preparing for the admission of women to the episcopate.

no secrets are hid: Cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of your Holy Spirit, that we may perfectly love you, and worthily magnify your holy Name; through Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE PRESENTATION

The bishops and people sit. Representatives of the diocese, both Priests and Lay Persons,¹⁰ standing before the Presiding Bishop, present the bishop-elect, saying

N., Bishop in the Church of God, the clergy and people of the Diocese of N., trusting in the guidance of the Holy Spirit,¹¹ have chosen N.N. to be a bishop and chief pastor. We therefore ask you to lay your hands upon him and in the power of the Holy Spirit to consecrate him a bishop in the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church.

The Presiding Bishop then directs that testimonials of the election be read.

When the reading of the testimonials is ended, the Presiding Bishop requires the following promise from the Bishop-elect

In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, I, N.N., chosen Bishop of the Church in N., solemnly declare that I do believe the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of God, and to contain all things necessary to salvation; and I do solemnly engage to conform to the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the /Protestant/ Episcopal Church /in the United States of America/.

The Bishop-elect then signs the above Declaration in the sight of all

10. As in RP, the presenters are no longer bishops, but priests (and here lay persons as well) from the diocese where the new bishop will serve.

11. This properly acknowledges the place of the Holy Spirit in the selection process, and does not exclude him until the act of consecration. This point is not made in the other rites.

present. The witnesses add their signatures.

All stand.

The Presiding Bishop then says the following, or similar words, and asks the response of the people

Brothers and sisters in Christ Jesus, you have heard testimony given that N.N. has been duly and lawfully elected to be a bishop of the Church of God to serve in the Diocese of N. You have been assured of his suitability and that the Church has approved him for this sacred responsibility. Nevertheless, if any of you know any reason why we should not proceed, let it now be made known.¹²

If no objection is made, the Presiding Bishop continues
Is it your will that we ordain N. a bishop?

The People respond in these or other words
That is our will.

Presiding Bishop
Will you uphold N. as bishop?

The People respond in these or other words
We will.

The Presiding Bishop then says
The Scriptures tell us that our Savior Christ spent the whole night in prayer before he chose and sent forth his twelve apostles. Likewise, the apostles prayed before they appointed Matthias to be one of their number. Let us, therefore, follow their examples, and offer our prayers

12. This is the only rite of those we are considering that has continued the tradition of providing a place for public disagreement to be registered.

to Almighty God before we ordain N. for the work to which we trust the Holy Spirit has called him.¹³

All kneel, and the Person appointed leads the Litany for Ordinations, or some other approved litany.¹⁴

God the Father, Have mercy on us.

God the Son, Have mercy on us.

God the Holy Spirit, Have mercy on us.

Holy Trinity, one God, Have mercy on us.

We pray to you, Lord Christ.

Lord, hear our prayer. /This response is used after each petition until the last./

For the holy Church of God, that it may be filled with truth and love, and be found without fault at the Day of your Coming, we pray to you, O Lord. R.

For all members of your Church in their vocation and ministry, that they may serve you in a true and godly life, we pray to you, O Lord. R.

For N., our Presiding Bishop, and for all bishops, priests, and deacons, that they may be filled with your love, may hunger for truth, and may thirst after righteousness, we pray to you, O Lord. R.

For N., chosen bishop in your Church, we pray to you, O Lord. R.

13. This invitation is a moderate revision of the one in the 1928 American BCP, which is a revision of the 1662 BCP invitation.

14. In the new Prayer Book, the Litany for Ordinations is printed separately at the conclusion of the three services. For the reader's convenience I have inserted it here in its proper place as it would be used in an episcopal ordination. This use of the Litany makes it the first primary act of worship, as it often was in ancient and medieval services (particularly when used in procession). It is seen here as a preparation for the whole people rather than particularly for the elect immediately prior to his ordination (as in RP and CE).

That he may faithfully fulfill the duties of this ministry, build up your Church, and glorify your Name, we pray to you, O Lord. R.

That by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit he may be sustained and encouraged to persevere to the end, we pray to you, O Lord. R.

For his family [the members of his household or community], that they may be adorned with all Christian virtues, we pray to you, O Lord. R.

For all who fear God and believe in you, Lord Christ, that our divisions may cease and that all may be one as you and the Father are one, we pray to you, O Lord. R.

For the mission of the Church, that in faithful witness it may preach the Gospel to the ends of the earth, we pray to you, O Lord. R.

For those who do not yet believe, and for those who have lost their faith, that they may receive the light of the Gospel, we pray to you, O Lord. R.

For the peace of the world, that a spirit of respect and forbearance may grow among nations and peoples, we pray to you, O Lord. R.

For those in positions of public trust [especially _____], that they may serve justice and promote the dignity and freedom of every person, we pray to you, O Lord. R.

For a blessing upon all human labor, and for the right use of the riches of creation, that the world may be freed from poverty, famine, and disaster, we pray to you, O Lord. R.

For the poor, the persecuted, the sick, and all who suffer; for refugees, prisoners, and all who are in danger; that they may be relieved and protected, we pray to you, O Lord. R.

For ourselves; for the forgiveness of our sins, and for the grace of the Holy Spirit to amend our lives, we pray to you, O Lord. R.

For all who have died in the communion of your Church, and those whose faith is known to you alone, that, with all the saints, they may have rest in that place where there is no pain or grief, but life eternal, we pray to you, O Lord. R.

Rejoicing in the fellowship of [the ever-blessed Virgin Mary, (blessed N.) and] all the saints, let us commend ourselves, and one another, and all our life to Christ our God.

To you, O Lord our God.

Lord, have mercy.

Christ, have mercy.

Lord, have mercy.

At the end of the litany, after the Kyries, the Presiding Bishop stands and reads the Collect for the Day, or the following Collect, or both, first saying

The Lord be with you.

People And also with you.

Let us pray.

O God of unchangeable power and eternal light: Look favorably on your whole Church, that wonderful and sacred mystery; by the effectual working of your providence, carry out in tranquillity the plan of salvation; let the whole world see and know that things which were cast down are being raised up, and things which had grown old are being made new, and that all things are being brought to their perfection by him through whom all things were made, your Son Jesus Christ our Lord; who lives and reigns with you, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, one God, for ever and ever. Amen.¹⁵

THE MINISTRY OF THE WORD

Three lessons are read. Lay persons read the Old Testament Lesson and the Epistle.

15. The collect first proposed in Prayer Book Studies 20 was: Almighty God, by whose Holy Spirit your people are provided with true and faithful pastors: By the same Spirit kindle in this your servant such love toward you, that he may witness to you in holiness of life, zealously proclaim the Gospel, and gather a people reconciled in your Son, Jesus Christ our Lord; who lives and reigns....

The present collect is used for all three orders and emphasizes the eschatological dimension of the ministry. It is also used in the new Good Friday liturgy (p. 280 of the new Prayer Book).

The Readings are ordinarily selected from the following list and may be lengthened if desired. On a Major Feast or on a Sunday, the Presiding Bishop may select Readings from the Proper of the Day.¹⁶

Old Testament Isaiah 61:1-8, or Isaiah 42:1-9

Psalm 99, or 40:1-14,¹⁷ or 100

Epistle Hebrews 5:1-10, or I Timothy 3:1-7, or 2 Corinthians 3:4-9

The Reader first says

A Reading (Lesson) from _____.

A citation giving chapter and verse may be added.

After each Reading, the Reader may say

 The Word of the Lord.

People Thanks be to God.

or the Reader may say Here ends the Reading (Epistle).

Silence may follow.

A Psalm, canticle, or hymn follows each Reading.

Then, all standing, a Deacon or a Priest reads the Gospel, first saying

 The Holy Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ according to _____.

People Glory to you, Lord Christ.

 John 20:19-23, or John 17:1-9, 18-21, or Luke 24:44-49a

After the Gospel, the Reader says

 The Gospel of the Lord.

16. The lections for all the rites are considered at the end of this chapter.

17. This was the introit psalm for ordinations in 1549 BCP.

People Praise to you, Lord Christ.

THE SERMON

After the Sermon, the Congregation sings a hymn.

THE EXAMINATION

All now sit, except the bishop-elect, who stands facing the bishops. The Presiding Bishop addresses the bishop-elect

My brother, the people have chosen you and have affirmed their trust in you by acclaiming your election. A bishop in God's holy Church is called to be one with the apostles in proclaiming Christ's resurrection and interpreting the Gospel, and to testify to Christ's sovereignty as Lord of lords and King of kings.¹⁸

You are called to guard the faith, unity, and discipline of the Church; to celebrate and to provide for the administration of the sacraments of the New Covenant; to ordain priests and deacons and to join in ordaining bishops; and to be in all things a faithful pastor and wholesome example for the entire flock of Christ.

With your fellow bishops you will share in the leadership of the Church throughout the world. Your heritage is the faith of patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and martyrs, and those of every generation who have looked to God in hope.¹⁹ Your joy will be to follow him who came, not to be served, but to serve, and to give his life a ransom for many.²⁰

18. See 1978 Lambeth Conference Resolution 18. The intent of this first paragraph is to define who the bishop is; the other two define what he is to do.

19. Again, the eschatological aspect of the faith is implied.

20. The emphasis here is on following Christ, and not on service per se, thus preserving priorities and guarding against a Pelagian concept of the office.

Are you persuaded that God has called you to the office of bishop?

Answer I am so persuaded.

The following questions are then addressed to the bishop-elect by one or more of the other bishops²¹

Bishop Will you accept this call and fulfill this trust in obedience to Christ?

Answer I will obey Christ, and will serve in his name.

Bishop Will you be faithful in prayer, and in the study of Holy Scripture, that you may have the mind of Christ?

Answer I will, for he is my help.

Bishop Will you boldly proclaim and interpret the Gospel of Christ, enlightening the minds and stirring up the conscience of your people?

Answer I will, in the power of the Spirit.

Bishop As a chief priest and pastor, will you encourage and support all baptized people in their gifts and ministries, nourish them from the riches of God's grace, pray for them without ceasing, and celebrate with them the sacraments of our redemption?

Answer I will, in the name of Christ, the Shepherd and Bishop of our souls.

Bishop Will you guard the faith, unity, and discipline of the Church?

Answer I will, for the love of God.

Bishop Will you share with your fellow bishops in the government of the

21. The shared questioning, unique to this rite, is an effective way of symbolizing the concern of the whole episcopate for the choice of proper persons to be added to their number.

whole Church; will you sustain your fellow presbyters and take counsel with them; will you guide and strengthen the deacons and all others who minister in the Church?

Answer I will, by the grace given to me.

Bishop Will you be merciful to all, show compassion to the poor and strangers, and defend those who have no helper?

Answer I will, for the sake of Christ Jesus.

All stand. The Presiding Bishop then says

N., through these promises you have committed yourself to God, to serve his Church in the office of bishop. We therefore call upon you, chosen to be a guardian of the Church's faith, to lead us in confessing that faith.²²

Bishop-elect

We believe in one God.

Then all sing or say together

[Here is printed the Nicene Creed as recommended by the International Consultation on English Texts.]

THE CONSECRATION OF THE BISHOP

All continue to stand, except the bishop-elect, who kneels before the Presiding Bishop. The other bishops stand to the right and left of the Presiding Bishop.

The hymn, Veni Creator Spiritus, or the hymn, Veni Sancte Spiritus, is

22. This is the most significant use of the Creed in the rites we are examining, and it is an adaptation of a tradition in the ordination rites of the Eastern churches. As we have already seen, RP omits the Creed altogether.

sung.²³

A period of silent prayer²⁴ follows, the people still standing.

The Presiding Bishop then begins this Prayer of Consecration²⁵
God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Father of mercies and God of all
comfort, dwelling on high but having regard for the lowly, knowing all
things before they come to pass: We give you thanks that from the be-
ginning you have gathered and prepared a people to be heirs of the cove-
nant of Abraham, and have raised up prophets, kings, and priests, never
leaving your temple untended. We praise you also that from the creation
you have graciously accepted the ministry of those whom you have chosen.

The Presiding Bishop and other Bishops now lay their hands upon the head
of the bishop-elect, and say together²⁶

Therefore, Father, make N. a bishop in your Church. Pour out upon him
the power of your princely Spirit, whom you bestowed upon your beloved
Son Jesus Christ, with whom he endowed the apostles, and by whom your
Church is built up in every place, to the glory and unceasing praise of
your Name.

23. ECUSA has retained the Anglican tradition of closely associating
the Veni Creator Spiritus with the actual consecration. See CSI, n. 30.

24. This period of silent prayer is an addition to the rite of epis-
copal consecration in the Anglican tradition to conform to what has been
done in the ordination of priests where silent prayer has been required
on behalf of the candidates before the singing of the hymn to the Holy
Spirit.

25. ECUSA has followed the Roman pattern in the use of the Hippolytean
prayer. For commentary on this prayer, see pp. 53-62.

26. The Anglican pattern is to join form (prayer) with matter (laying
on of hands). Compare this with the Roman procedure of a distinct sepa-
ration (Rubrics 24-26 in RP).

The Presiding Bishop continues

To you, O Father, all hearts are open; fill, we pray, the heart of this your servant whom you have chosen to be a bishop in your Church, with such love of you and of all the people, that he may feed and tend the flock of Christ, and exercise without reproach the high priesthood to which you have called him, serving before you day and night in the ministry of reconciliation, declaring pardon in your Name, offering the holy gifts, and wisely overseeing the life and work of the Church. In all things may he present before you the acceptable offering of a pure, and gentle, and holy life; through Jesus Christ your Son, to whom, with you and the Holy Spirit, be honor and power and glory in the Church, now and for ever.

The People in a loud voice respond Amen.

The new bishop is now vested according to the order of bishops.²⁷

A Bible is presented with these words

Receive the Holy Scriptures. Feed the flock of Christ committed to your charge, guard and defend them in his truth, and be a faithful steward of his holy Word and Sacraments.

After this other symbols of office may be given.

The Presiding Bishop presents to the people their new bishop.

The Clergy and People offer their acclamation and applause.

THE PEACE

The new Bishop then says

The peace of the Lord be always with you.

27. See n. 8. Previously the bishop-elect put on the "rest of the Episcopal habit" prior to the Veni Creator Spiritus.

People And also with you.

The Presiding Bishop and other Bishops greet the new bishop.

The People greet one another.

The new Bishop also greets other members of the clergy, family members, and the congregation.

The new Bishop, if the Bishop of the Diocese, may now be escorted to the episcopal chair.

AT THE CELEBRATION OF THE EUCHARIST

The liturgy continues with the Offertory.

Deacons prepare the Table.

Then the new Bishop goes to the Lord's Table as chief Celebrant and, joined by other bishops and presbyters,²⁸ proceeds with the celebration of the Eucharist.²⁹

28. This demonstrates simultaneously the bishop's membership in the episcopal college and his collegial relationship with his presbyters.

29. Although no mention is made of it either in the rite itself or in the directions, the Prayer Book does include a proper preface (pp. 348 and 381) under the title "Apostles and Ordinations." Following is the contemporary language version:

Through the great shepherd of your flock, Jesus Christ
our Lord; who after his resurrection sent forth his
apostles to preach the Gospel and to teach all nations;
and promised to be with them always, even to the end of
the ages.

This strikes the two notes of mission and eschatology.

AFTER COMMUNION

In place of the usual postcommunion prayer, one of the bishops leads the people in the following

Almighty Father, we thank you for feeding us with the holy food of the Body and Blood of your Son, and for uniting us through him in the fellowship of your Holy Spirit. We thank you for raising up among us faithful servants for the ministry of your Word and Sacraments. We pray that N. may be to us an effective example in word and action, in love and patience, and in holiness of life. Grant that we, with him, may serve you now, and always rejoice in your glory; through Jesus Christ your Son our Lord, who lives and reigns with you and the Holy Spirit, one God, now and for ever. Amen.³⁰

The new Bishop blesses the people, first saying

Our help is in the Name of the Lord;

People The maker of heaven and earth.

New Bishop Blessed be the Name of the Lord;

People From this time forth for evermore.

New Bishop The blessing, mercy, and grace of God Almighty, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, be upon you, and remain with you for ever. Amen.

A Deacon dismisses the people

Let us go forth into the world, rejoicing in the power of the Spirit.

People Thanks be to God.

From Easter Day through the Day of Pentecost "Alleluia, alleluia," may be added to the dismissal and to the response.

30. This is the same postcommunion prayer as that appointed for use at the ordination of deacons and priests.

ADDITIONAL DIRECTIONS

At all Ordinations

The celebration of the Holy Eucharist may be according to Rite One or Rite Two.³¹ In either case, the rubrics of the service of ordination are followed. The Summary of the Law, the Gloria in Excelsis, the Prayers of the People after the Creed, the General Confession, and the usual postcommunion prayer are not used.

At the Presentation of the Ordinand, the Declaration "I do believe the Holy Scriptures..." is to be provided as a separate document to be signed, as directed by Article VIII of the Constitution of this Church and by the rubrics in each of the ordination rites. (When there are more ordinands than one, each is to be presented with a separate copy for signature.)

The hymn to the Holy Spirit before the Prayer of Consecration may be sung responsively between a bishop and the congregation, or in some other convenient manner.

If vestments or other symbols of office are to be dedicated, such blessing is to take place at some convenient time prior to the service.³² The following form may be used³³

V. Our help is in the Name of the Lord;

R. The maker of heaven and earth.

V. The Lord be with you.

R. And also with you.

31. In the new Prayer Book, Rite One is closer to the service found in the 1928 Book, with traditional wording; Rite Two is an extensive liturgical revision, comparable to Series 3 in the Church of England.

32. See RP, n. 8.

33. This prayer is based on the one in RP (p. 275), but with some change in emphasis.

Let us pray.

Everliving God, whose power is limitless, we place before you, with our praise and thanks, these tokens of your servant's ministry and dignity. Grant that No., who has been called to leadership in your Church, and bears these signs, may faithfully serve you and share in the fullness of your life-giving Spirit; through the high priest and good shepherd of us all, Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

At the Ordination of a Bishop

Following the Consecration Prayer, and while the new bishop is being clothed with the vesture of the episcopate, instrumental music may be played.

Following the presentation of the Bible, and the formula "Receive the Holy Scriptures..." a ring, staff, and mitre, or other suitable insignia of office may be presented.

During the Eucharistic Prayer, it is appropriate that some of the consecrating bishops, and representative presbyters of the diocese, stand with the new bishop at the Altar as fellow ministers of the Sacrament.

The newly ordained bishop, assisted by other ministers, distributes Holy Communion to the people. When necessary, the administration may take place at several conveniently separated places in the church.

After the pontifical blessing and the dismissal, a hymn of praise may be sung.

The bishops who are present are not to depart without signing the Letters of Consecration.

The American Episcopalians have produced a consecration rite for bishops that reflects the results of both the liturgical movement and the recent theological efforts to understand the history, meaning, and scope of the episcopal office. They have, however, not been able to overcome the traditional Anglican uncertainty about the relation of the episcopacy to the presbyterate.

They have followed the Roman lead in using the Hippolytean consecration prayer, and in the introduction to the Examination they have endeavored to explain the bishop's role and function. Such an explanation is necessary because, as we have seen, the Hippolytean prayer conceives of a bishop as almost if not quite the equivalent of a twentieth century parish priest in terms of the duties enumerated. Even RP finds that the long homily of passages culled from the Vatican II documents is necessary to make plain who and what a bishop is today. And it succeeds in that it makes clear that the bishop has the fullness of priesthood, is the authorized successor to the apostolic college as long as he remains in hierarchical communion with the episcopal college, and that in the bishop Christ the High Priest is present in the midst of the faithful. Further, RP, in the ordination to the presbyterate, does not employ questions in the Examination which would tend to confuse the rank and source of priesthood with that of the episcopate.

ECUSA now calls what happens to both priest and bishop "ordination" in the titles of the services. This is no doubt intended to make clear the distinct character of episcopal orders, but the sub-section in which the imposition of hands with prayer occurs in each service is headed

"The Consecration of the Bishop" and "The Consecration of the Priest." Nothing really has changed from 1549, except that it is now possible to say that priests are as truly "consecrated" as are bishops, which does not help to preserve the distinction between the two.

If the framers of the Ordinal wished to be more explicit about the distinction between the orders they might have given more attention to terms which, when seen by themselves in a single rite, appear self-evident, but when viewed comparatively contribute to a vagueness about the exact relationship of bishop to priest. The priest is asked if he believes that he is truly called "to this priesthood." A state of existence is implied. The bishop, on the other hand, is asked if he is persuaded that God has called him "to the office of bishop." "Office" does not carry the connotations of "state of being" that priesthood does; it implies a job, a duty. If the rite wishes to be consistent with the Hippolytean prayer of consecration which it employs, it would have been more in keeping to ask the presbyteral candidate if he feels truly called to the work of the presbyterate (or the priestly work of the presbyterate, after RP), and to ask the bishop if he is persuaded that God has called him to the high priestly office of bishop. ECUSA does not shy away from the term presbyter the way RP does, so there is no reason why it should neglect to make the distinction.

The Examination of the bishop-elect begins by saying what a bishop is, in words later incorporated into the Lambeth Conference resolutions: "A bishop in God's holy Church is called to be one with the apostles in proclaiming Christ's resurrection and interpreting the Gospel, and to

testify to Christ's sovereignty as Lord of lords and King of kings." This sounds as though it could be interpreted as apostolic succession, but only in the sense that the entire Church is apostolic (as expressed in the Accra document, Sec. 27), and so the bishops are apostolic not by virtue of their order but of their baptism. The Examination of priests says, "All baptized people are called to make Christ known as Savior and Lord, and to share in the renewing of his world." And how is that to be done if not by proclaiming the resurrection and acknowledging Christ's sovereignty? If "interpreting the Gospel" is a definition of preaching, the priest is clearly told that he is "to preach." To be "one with the apostles," then, is not the same thing as being their legitimate successors in a unique order and capacity.

The priest is told that he is to fashion his life in accordance with the precepts of the Gospel. The bishop is told that he is to be a "wholesome example for the entire flock of Christ." The priest is "to love and serve the people among whom he works, caring alike for young and old, strong and weak, rich and poor." The bishop is asked if he will "be merciful to all, show compassion to the poor and strangers, and defend those who have no helper." The bishop is asked to "encourage and support all baptized people in their gifts and ministries, nourish them from the riches of God's grace, pray for them without ceasing, and celebrate with them the sacraments of our redemption." The priest is told that he is "to nourish Christ's people from the riches of his grace;" he is "to share in the administration of Holy Baptism and in the celebration of the mysteries of Christ's Body and

Blood," and he is asked to "persevere in prayer, both in public and private,... both for yourself and for others...."

It might be objected that "to share in" implies an ability or a right delegated by the bishop, but this is never made explicit. Indeed, earlier in the Examination, the priest-to-be is told that he is "called to work as a pastor, priest, and teacher, together with /empha-
sis mine/ your bishop and fellow presbyters, and to take your share in the councils of the Church." And the episcopal ordinand is asked if he will "sustain /his/ fellow presbyters" (although it might be objected that the candidate is still a presbyter at the time the question is asked were it not that the same question also asks about sharing "with your fellow bishops").

The bishop as an agent of reconciliation or receiver of penitents is not mentioned in the Examination, although it has a special place in the consecratory prayer ("serving before you day and night in the ministry of reconciliation, declaring pardon in your Name"). The priest is told in the introduction to the Examination that he is "to declare God's forgiveness to penitent sinners," and in the questions he is asked if he will endeavor so to "minister the Word of God and the sacraments of the New Covenant, that the reconciling love of Christ may be known and received."

It is also instructive to look at what the catechism in the new Prayer Book has to say about the orders of bishop and priest. The catechism presumably represents the Church's official teaching on the subject, and its language is taken from the Ordinal. To look at the two

statements in parallel columns will illustrate how ECUSA is still attempting to resolve the clash of identities between bishop and presbyter. The questions asked are, "What is the ministry of a bishop?" and "What is the ministry of a priest or presbyter?" (pp. 855-56).

The ministry of a bishop is to represent Christ and his Church, particularly as apostle, chief pastor, and pastor of the diocese; to guard the faith, unity, and discipline of the whole Church; to proclaim the Word of God; to act in Christ's name for the reconciliation of the world and the building up of the Church; and to ordain others to continue Christ's ministry.

The ministry of a priest is to represent Christ and his Church, particularly as pastor to the people; to share with the bishop in the overseeing of the Church; to proclaim the Gospel; to administer the sacraments; and to bless and declare pardon in the name of God.

This statement gives the bishop pastoral pre-eminence and makes him responsible for ordination, but it does not distinguish his priestly role from that of the presbyter in any significant way. Indeed, it is the presbyter who is said to have the function of administering the sacraments, and the bishop's sacramental pre-eminence as diocesan high priest is ignored entirely. The catechism provides ample evidence for describing the bishop as a priest set apart to govern and ordain. It provides no evidence for maintaining that there is any essential difference of order.

There is, then, no reference in either rite or rubrics to the bishop as he who has the fullness of order, and, with the exception of ordination, it is impossible to distinguish how the episcopate is in any way a higher priesthood than the presbyterate.

At the conclusion of the last chapter we isolated six functions out of the official Resolutions of the Lambeth Conference of 1978 as those which should particularly apply to the bishop. We will now use those as our frame of reference for determining what this Ordinal says about the ministry of bishops.

The first we have already made reference to, and little needs to be added. The Lambeth statement is adopted from the Ordinal's introduction to the Examination. The bishop is one with the apostles in proclaiming Christ's resurrection, in interpreting the Gospel, and in testifying to Christ's sovereignty. We should recall that in accepting this statement Lambeth rejected that of the section which dealt with the ministry of bishops and had said that the episcopal ministry is given "through the laying on of hands by other bishops in succession to Christ the original Apostle." In the light of that rejection, it is not surprising that the ECUSA Ordinal should be found to have no references to the bishop as the (or even a) means by which Christ is made present in the midst of his people. The Ordinal does say, in that same introduction, that the bishop is the inheritor of "the faith of patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and martyrs, and those of every generation who have looked to God in hope," and while the eschatological significance of that last phrase ought not be overlooked, it does not require an interpretation of the episcopacy as a sign of God's faithfulness to the end of time. Apostolic succession, as Bishop Gore would have understood it, remains a matter for theological discussion, and finds no place in the Ordinal of the American Episcopal Church.

The second of the Lambeth assertions is that the bishop participates in the ministry of the prophets in his concern for the whole community's welfare and in his public involvement in issues of justice, mercy, and truth. Two of the questions in the Examination are applicable here: "Will you boldly proclaim and interpret the Gospel of Christ, enlightening the minds and stirring up the conscience of your people?" and "Will you be merciful to all, show compassion to the poor and strangers, and defend those who have no helper?" The prophetic note is sounded strongly in the suggested readings from the Old Testament (see the commentary at the end of this chapter) and two of the three psalms recommended for use. That he should expect the support of his people in this ministry is emphasized at the time of the declaration of assent by the congregation. The people are not only asked to affirm their willingness to have him ordained, but they are then asked, "Will you uphold N. as bishop?" This particular question is unique to the rites we are examining and lays the groundwork for that reciprocity we discussed in the last chapter.

Thirdly, the bishop is to be the leader in the Christian community, but he is to be among his people as one who serves. The Preface to the Ordinal says that it is part of the apostolic work to lead and supervise. The bishop is referred to as "chief pastor" in more than one place, and in the introduction to the Examination he is told that he "will share in the leadership of the Church throughout the world." He is responsible for the discipline as well as the faith and unity of the whole Church. The Examination stresses his leadership role as a member of the college of bishops: "Will you share with your fellow bishops in the government

of the whole Church;" and the collegial nature of his leadership in the diocese: "will you sustain your fellow presbyters and take counsel with them." The consecratory prayer asks that he may wisely oversee the life and work of the Church. And, in the ordination of priests and deacons, both are asked if they will be guided by the "pastoral direction and leadership" of the bishop. The servant nature of the office is called to mind in the introduction to the Examination when the elect is told that "your joy will be to follow him who came, not to be served, but to serve, and to give his life a ransom for many."

That the bishop has an obligation of setting an example to his people is not emphasized as strongly in this rite as formerly. If the I Timothy option is chosen for the Epistle (and the text of the ordination sermon!) much could be made of this obligation. The Examination introduction says that he is to be a "wholesome example for the entire flock of Christ," and the last question, concerning his duty to the needy, could be interpreted in the nature of setting an example. The consecratory prayer asks that he "exercise without reproach the high priesthood," and that he may "present before you the acceptable offering of a pure, and gentle, and holy life." The postcommunion prayer, which is common to all three ordination rites, says, "We pray that N. may be to us an effective example in word and action, in love and patience, and in holiness of life." But the need to drive home the necessity to "deny all ungodliness and worldly lusts, and live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world" does not appear to be as pressing in the twentieth century as it was in the sixteenth.

The bishop's responsibility as guardian of the faith (exercised collegially with the other bishops) finds expression at the very beginning of the rite when the elect is required to subscribe to a statement that he believes the "Old and New Testaments to be the Word of God, and to contain all things necessary to salvation." This statement defines where the faith is to be found and the final source of appeal in all disagreements. So in the presentation of the Bible after the consecratory prayer:

Receive the Holy Scriptures. Feed the flock of Christ committed to your charge, guard and defend them in his truth, and be a faithful steward of his holy Word and Sacraments.

The Examination asks him if he will guard the faith of the Church; the introduction has already listed that as one of his duties, and the third paragraph which speaks of his sharing with the other bishops in leadership in its first sentence immediately moves in the second to telling him what his heritage of faith is. We called attention in the rite itself (n. 22) to the special use made of the Creed in the service.

Finally, of the points emphasized by the Lambeth Resolutions, there is the need of the Church that the bishop is to be a focus of unity, thus entailing that all the baptized should remain in communion with him, and that he is responsible for the pastoral role of healing divisions and maintaining and strengthening the fellowship of the Church. According to the Preface, part of the apostolic work the bishops carry on is the uniting of the Church. This guardianship of unity is mentioned explicitly in the introduction to the Examination and in one of the

questions. Although nothing is said specifically about healing divisions, that is implied in the references to caring for and feeding the flock. "The ministry of reconciliation" will have broader connotations in our day than simply the admission of penitent sinners back to communion. The responsibility of the baptized to remain in communion with the bishop must be derived by implication as well from those same passages. The new rite for baptism asks, "Will you continue in the apostles' teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread, and in the prayers?" If the bishop is the custodian of the apostles' teaching (and we saw that there is no necessary warrant for such an interpretation in this rite), then continued communion with the bishop is an obligation upon the baptized.

The one duty of the bishop not mentioned in the Lambeth Resolutions, but specified in the Preface and enumerated among his duties in the Examination introduction, is that of ordaining. The Preface says that

No persons are allowed to exercise the offices of bishop, priest, or deacon in this Church unless they are so ordained, or have already received such ordination ... by bishops who are themselves duly qualified to confer Holy Orders.

Clearly, it is the ability to confer orders that marks the fullness of priesthood for the framers of this Ordinal. Regardless of how vague they may be about the distinction between presbyter and bishop, all uncertainty ceases at this point. "They are not ordained who have not been thus ordained," said the Tracts for the Times, and one feels that the primary function of episcopacy for the American Episcopalians is still the safeguarding of presbyteral "validity."

THE ORDINATION OR CONSECRATION OF A BISHOP¹
according to the proposed Ordination Services
of the Church of England

CANONS RELATING TO MINISTRY²

C 1 Of holy orders in the Church of England

1. The Church of England holds and teaches that from the Apostles' time there have been these orders in Christ's Church: bishops, priests, and deacons; and no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful bishop, priest, or deacon in the Church of England, or suffered to execute any of the said offices, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto according to the Ordinal or any form of service alternative thereto approved by the General Synod under Canon B 2 or has had formerly episcopal consecration or ordination in some Church whose orders are recognized and accepted by the Church of England.

C 2 Of the consecration of bishops

1. No person shall be consecrated to the office of bishop by fewer than three bishops present together and joining in the act of consecration, of whom one shall be the archbishop of the province or a bishop appointed to act on his behalf.

1. The use of both terms is evidence of the attempt in CE to establish the episcopate as a full and distinct third order in the sense defined by Vatican II, and it allows for either a "protestant" or "catholic" interpretation. The same pattern is followed by COCU. The text reproduced here is from Ordination Services: A Report by the Liturgical Commission of the General Synod of the Church of England (London, 1977), pp. 7, 26-34.

2. Presumably a Preface to the Ordinal will be written after the services have received final approval. These canons were placed at the beginning of the proposed services to illustrate the guidelines within which the Liturgical Commission had to work.

2. The consecration of a bishop shall take place upon some Sunday or Holy Day, unless the archbishop, for urgent and weighty cause, shall appoint some other day.

THE ORDINATION OR CONSECRATION OF A BISHOP

Stand

This sentence may be said:³

Pray the Lord of the harvest that he send out labourers
into the harvest. Luke 10:2

At the entry of the ministers, a hymn, canticle, or psalm may be sung.

The Archbishop The Lord be with you.

All And also with you.

The collect⁴ Almighty and everlasting God,
by whose Spirit the whole body of your faithful people
is governed and sanctified:
hear our prayer for your servant,
now to be ordained to the ministry of a bishop;
fill us with the knowledge of your truth,
adorn us with innocency of life,
that each in his vocation and ministry
may serve to the glory of your name
and to the good of your Church;
through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

All Amen.

3. Used for deacons and priests as well.

4. The collect is the same for deacons and priests, the name of the order only being changed. Note its emphasis on the ministry of the whole people.

THE MINISTRY OF THE WORD⁵

Sit

The Old Testament Lesson Numbers 27.15-20,22.

At the end the reader⁶ may say:

 This is the word of the Lord.

All Thanks be to God.

Stand

Psalm 119.165-174

Sit

The Epistle 2 Cor. 4.1-10 (NEB)

At the end the reader may say:

 This is the word of the Lord.

All Thanks be to God.

Stand

A canticle or a hymn may be sung.

The Gospel John 21.15-17

When it is announced

All Glory to Christ our Saviour.

At the end the reader says:

 This is the Gospel of Christ.

5. The lections will be discussed at the end of this chapter.

6. Bishops are no longer specified as readers, thus providing opportunity for the use of lay persons, deacons, and priests in the Ministry of the Word, although no rubric or direction makes their use mandatory, as in ECUSA.

All Praise to Christ our Lord.

Sit

The sermon

Stand

The Nicene Creed

THE PRESENTATION

Two bishops⁷ present the Bishop-elect, saying:

Reverend Father, we present N to be ordained and consecrated to the office of bishop in the Church of God.⁸

The Archbishop Let the authority for the ordination be read.

The Provincial Registrar reads the Royal Mandate.

When the Mandate has been read, the Archbishop presents the Bishop-elect to the people, saying:

You have heard that N has been chosen to be ordained bishop by those who have authority to do so. Do you therefore declare your assent to his ordination?⁹

People We do.

If the Oath of Allegiance and the Oath of Canonical Obedience have not been taken before the start of the service, they are taken at this point.

The Archbishop or his commissary shall then read the Preface to the Dec-

7. This continues the practice of 1662 and earlier.

8. This is a relative ordination in spite of the fact that no mention is made of the church (diocese) for which the elect is being ordained. Such designation follows immediately in the Royal Mandate.

9. The assent of the people is a new feature in CE.

laration of Assent:

The Church of England is part of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, worshipping the one true God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. She professes the faith uniquely revealed in the holy Scriptures and set forth in the catholic creeds, which faith the Church is called upon to proclaim afresh in each generation. Led by the Holy Spirit, she has borne witness to Christian truth in her historic formularies, the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, the Book of Common Prayer, and the Ordering of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.¹⁰ In the declaration you are about to make, will you affirm your loyalty to this inheritance of faith as your inspiration and guidance under God in bringing the grace and truth of Christ to this generation and making him known to those in your care?

The Bishop-elect I, N₂ do so affirm, and accordingly declare my belief in the faith which is revealed in the holy Scriptures and set forth in the catholic creeds and to which the historic formularies of the Church of England bear witness; and in public prayer and administration of the sacraments, I will use only the forms of service which are authorized or allowed by Canon.

THE DECLARATION¹¹

10. This sentence is not quite clear. Based upon the elect's response, it seems to be saying that the historic formularies are the Articles, BCP, and Ordinal to the exclusion of any other material.

11. The term "Declaration" rather than "Examination" is an innovation peculiar to CE. Canon Cuming explained to the General Synod:

Turning to the section headed 'The Declaration', the Anglican/Methodist Ordinal called this 'The Examination', no doubt deriving the title from the Prayer Book rubric, which

Sit

The Bishop-elect stands before the Archbishop, and the people sit.

The Archbishop A bishop is consecrated within the historic succession of the Church's ministry, as the Church of England has received it. As a chief minister, he is to lead in serving and caring for the people in the place where he is called to work, and to speak to them in the name of God. As a chief pastor he has, with his fellow-bishops, a special role within the people of God. He is to maintain and further the unity of the Church, to uphold its discipline, and to guard its faith. He is to promote its mission throughout the world. It is his duty to watch over and pray for all those committed to his charge, and to teach and govern them after the example of the Apostles, speaking and interpreting the gospel of Christ. He is to know his people and be known by them. He is to ordain and to send new ministers, guiding those who serve with him and enabling them to fulfil their ministry.

says 'The Bishop examines them'; but we felt that there was an element of unreality here. The bishop knows the answers to all the questions already. What the candidates are doing is making a public declaration of their belief in their vocation and their acceptance of its duties, so we have headed it 'The Declaration'. (G.S. Proceedings, VIII.2, p. 568)

In spite of the committee's logic, there seems to be some room for confusion, since immediately prior to this Declaration is what is known as the "Declaration of Assent" ("I, N, do so affirm..."), which is only denominated as such by the rubric stating that the archbishop shall read "the Preface to the Declaration of Assent." As the rubrics are now set forth, it is easy to believe that what follows with the questions is that Declaration. For the sake of conformity with the other rites under discussion, I will refer to the "Declaration" as the Examination.

He is to baptize and confirm, to preside at the Lord's Supper, and to lead the offering of prayer and praise. He is to be merciful, but with firmness, and to minister discipline, but with mercy.¹² He is to have a special care for the outcast and needy;¹³ and to those who turn to God he is to declare the forgiveness of sins.

The Archbishop says to the Bishop-elect:

In order that the people may know your mind and purpose, you must answer the questions which we shall now put to you.

Do you believe that God has called you to the office and work of a bishop in his Church?

Answer I believe that God has called me.

The Archbishop Do you accept the holy Scriptures as revealing all things necessary for eternal salvation through faith in Jesus Christ?

Answer I do so accept them.

The Archbishop Do you believe the doctrines of the Christian faith as the Church of England has received them, and in your ministry will you expound and teach them?

Answer I believe them, and will so do.

The Archbishop Will you accept the discipline of this Church and faithfully exercise authority within it?

Answer By the help of God, I will.

12. From the formula at the delivery of the Bible, BCP 1662.

13. This responsibility is mentioned only here; it has lost its traditional place among the questions which follow.

The Archbishop Will you be diligent in prayer, in reading holy Scripture, and in all studies that will deepen your faith and fit you for your work?

Answer By the help of God, I will.

The Archbishop Will you fashion your own life and that of your household to be an example to the people of God?

Answer By the help of God, I will.

The Archbishop Will you promote unity, peace, and love among all Christian people, and especially among those committed to your charge?

Answer By the help of God, I will.

The Archbishop Will you then be a faithful witness to Christ to those among whom you live, and lead your people to obey our Saviour's command to make disciples of all nations?

Answer By the help of God, I will.

The Archbishop Almighty God, who has given you the will to undertake all these things, give you also the strength to perform them; that he may complete that work which he has begun in you; through Jesus Christ our Lord.

All Amen.

THE PRAYERS

The Archbishop commends the Bishop-elect to the prayers of the people, and silence is kept.¹⁴

Veni creator is sung.¹⁵

14. This period of silence is an addition to the service on the model of the silent prayer in the 1662 ordering of priests. See ECUSA, p. 328.

15. See CSI, n. 30. In 1662 the elect puts on the rest of the episco-

The Archbishop¹⁶ leads the Prayers for the Bishop-elect and for the ministry of the whole Church.

Let us pray.

People God the Father
 have mercy on us.
 God the Son
 have mercy on us.
 God the Holy Spirit
 have mercy on us.
 Holy, blessed, and
 glorious Trinity
 have mercy on us.

From all evil and mischief;
from pride, vanity, and hypocrisy;
from envy, hatred, and malice;
and from all evil intent,
Good Lord, deliver us.

From sloth, worldliness, and love of money;
from hardness of heart and contempt for
your word and your laws,
Good Lord, deliver us.

From sins of body and mind,
from the deceits of the world, the flesh,
and the devil,

pal habit between the end of the Examination and the beginning of the Veni creator. This new rite makes no provision about vestments at any point.

16. This alone of the new rites clericalizes the leadership of the Litany and/or intercessions.

Good Lord, deliver us.

In all times of sorrow,
in all times of joy;
at the hour of death, and at the day of judgement,
Good Lord, deliver us.

Govern and direct your holy Church;
fill it with love and truth;
and grant it that unity which is your will:
Hear us, good Lord.

Give us boldness to preach the gospel
in all the world,
and to make disciples of all the nations:
Hear us, good Lord.

Enlighten your ministers with knowledge
and understanding,
that by their teaching and their lives
they may proclaim your word:
Hear us, good Lord.

Bless your servant now to be made bishop,
that he may serve your Church
and reveal your glory in the world:
Hear us, good Lord.

Give your people grace to hear
and receive your word,
and to bring forth the fruit of the Spirit:
Hear us, good Lord.

Bring into the way of truth all who have erred
and are deceived:

Hear us, good Lord.

Strengthen those who stand;
comfort and help the fainthearted;
raise up the fallen;
and finally beat down Satan under our feet:

Hear us, good Lord.

Give us true repentance;
forgive us our sins of negligence and ignorance,
and our deliberate sins;
and grant us the grace of your Holy Spirit
to amend our lives according to your holy word:
Holy God, holy and strong, holy and immortal,¹⁷
have mercy on us.

The Archbishop Almighty God, you have promised to hear those who pray
in the name of your Son. Grant that what we have asked
in faith we may obtain according to your will; through
Jesus Christ our Lord.¹⁸

All Amen.

THE ORDINATION¹⁹

The Archbishop stands with the bishops who assist him; the Bishop-elect
kneels before him; he stretches out his hands towards him, and says:

17. A form of the Trisagion adapted from Eastern usage.

18. This is interpreted by Canon Cuming as the absolution in response
to the confession at the end of the Litany. See General Synod Proceed-
ings VIII.2, p. 586.

19. See Anglican-Methodist Unity: 1. The Ordinal (London, 1968) for
the source of this prayer.

We praise and glorify you, almighty Father, because you have formed throughout the world a holy people for your own possession, a royal priesthood, a universal Church. We praise and glorify you because you have given us your only Son Jesus Christ to be the Apostle and High Priest of our faith, and the Shepherd of our souls. We praise and glorify you that by his death he has overcome death; and that, having ascended into heaven, he has given his gifts abundantly to your people, making some, apostles; some, prophets; some, evangelists; some, pastors and teachers; to equip them for the work of ministry and to build up his body. And now we give you thanks that you have called this your servant to share this ministry entrusted to your Church.²⁰

Here the Archbishop and other bishops lay their hands on the head of the Bishop-elect, and the Archbishop says:²¹

Send down your Holy Spirit upon your servant N, whom we now consecrate in your name to the office and work of a bishop in the Church.

The Archbishop then continues:

Almighty Father, fill this your servant with the grace and power which you gave to your Apostles, that he may lead those committed to his charge in proclaiming the gospel of salvation. Through him increase your Church, renew its ministry, and unite its members in a holy

20. The introductory portion of this prayer is the same as for the ordination of priests.

21. This rite continues the Anglican practice of combining form and matter. Note also that it is only the Archbishop who recites the essential form.

fellowship of truth and love. Enable him as a true shepherd to feed and govern your flock; make him wise as a teacher, and steadfast as a guardian of its faith and sacraments. Guide and direct him in presiding at the worship of your people. Give him humility, that he may use his authority to heal, not to hurt; to build up, not to destroy. Defend him from all evil, that as a ruler over your household and an ambassador for Christ he may stand before you blameless, and finally, with all your servants, enter your eternal joy.

Accept our prayers, most merciful Father, through your Son Jesus Christ our Lord, to whom, with you and your Holy Spirit, belong glory and honour, worship and praise, now and for ever.

The people say

Amen.

THE GIVING OF THE BIBLE AND THE PASTORAL STAFF

Sit²²

The newly-ordained bishop stands, and the Archbishop gives the Bible to him, saying:

Receive this Book; here are words of eternal life.
Take them for your guide, and declare them to the
world.²³

22. There has been no previous direction to stand or kneel. Presumably, then, the congregation has either been sitting since the beginning of the Examination or, out of custom, kneeling since the Litany. It is possible that the people are intended to be kneeling for the consecratory prayer, but one suspects (and hopes) that a rubric directing them to stand at the conclusion of the Litany has simply been overlooked. The ancient posture of standing is more appropriate to their priesthood.

23. A complete departure from the 1662 formula.

He gives a pastoral staff to him, saying:

Receive this staff as a sign of your pastoral office;
keep watch over the whole flock in which the Holy
Spirit has appointed you to shepherd the Church of God.
Encourage the faithful, restore the lost, build up the
body of Christ; that when the Chief Shepherd shall
appear, you may receive the unfading crown of glory.²⁴

THE COMMUNION

Stand

The Archbishop resumes the Communion Service at the Peace.

These special forms are used:²⁵

(a) Proper Thanksgiving

because by that same Spirit we are led into all truth
and are given power to proclaim your gospel to the na-
tions and to serve you as a royal priesthood.

(b) Postcommunion Sentence

The Son of Man came not to be served but to serve, and
to give his life as a ransom for many. Mark 10.45

24. A revision of the 1549 formula.

25. The same forms are also used at the ordinations of deacons and
priests. The original revision included the following postcommunion
collect: God our Father, shepherd and guide of all your faithful people:
look with favour on N your servant
whom you have chosen to be a pastor over your Church;
and grant that by word and example
he may lead the people committed to his charge,
and with them come to your eternal kingdom;
through Jesus Christ....

(c) Blessing

Almighty God, who for the salvation of mankind gives to his people many gifts and ministries to the advancement of his glory, stir up in you the gifts of grace, sustain each one of you in your own ministry;²⁶ and the blessing...

26. As the service began with the recollection of the ministry of all the people in the collect, so it closes with the same reminder in the blessing.

We will now employ again those six points of the Lambeth Resolutions to see how they relate to the new rite for the consecration of bishops in the Church of England. The point was made in the last chapter that lack of a central authority is becoming a matter of concern in the Anglican communion (pp. 217-18), and one can no longer assume that what have been considered doctrinal norms by all the churches are still maintained in the same way. The 1662 Prayer Book was itself thought to be such a norm, but with Prayer Book revision in England as well as in many other Anglican churches, and with those revisions often diverging markedly from one another, it can become little more than a valued and venerated historical landmark. The new American Prayer Book represents, by its use of the Hippolytean consecration prayer, an approach to a catholic and ecumenical consensus, attempting to place its liturgical roots for episcopacy as far back as the textual evidence will permit. It remains to be seen how many other churches in the Anglican communion will follow that lead. The Church of England has provided another option, one that tries to be truer

to what might be called the peculiar Anglican liturgical tradition in the style of Cranmer and the 1549 Ordinal. (The Church in Wales has already followed that pattern.) But, as an examination of the rite will indicate, CE is much more than a re-writing of 1549 or 1662 in contemporary English.

1. The bishop is one with the apostles in proclaiming Christ's resurrection, in interpreting the Gospel, and in testifying to Christ's sovereignty. The ordination prayer asks that God will "fill this your servant with the grace and power which you gave to your Apostles," and the Preface to the Declaration of Assent asserts that the "Church of England is part of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church." The introduction to the Examination (see n. 11, p. 348) says that the bishop is "to teach and govern ... after the example of the Apostles." None of these provide a sufficient basis on which to say that the Church's apostolicity is dependent upon the bishops. The same arguments we used in the ECUSA essay on the applicability of those three functions to all baptized Christians are equally pertinent here. There is no indication that the body of bishops succeeds to the apostolic college. Although the Preface to the 1662 Ordinal is clear that there are three orders of the ministry, as do the canons cited at the beginning of this rite, no interpretation is demanded that would identify the episcopal order with apostolic continuity. The preface to the Examination states that "A bishop is consecrated within the historic succession of the Church's ministry, as the Church of England has received it." No judgment is made about the source of the order or its authority, and the intent

seems still to be that which we observed about the Church of England in the sixteenth century. It chooses to have bishops because it has always had them. It is the "Church's ministry" that is the context, not the apostolic ministry either of the Twelve or of the Primary Apostle, Jesus Christ.

Nothing is said specifically in the rite about Christ's resurrection, but one would assume that it would have a major place in interpreting the Gospel, particularly if one is to teach "after the example of the Apostles." "Interpreting the gospel of Christ" is mentioned in the preface to the Examination. The question is also asked of the elect if he will lead his people "to obey our Saviour's command to make disciples of all nations." Since this command is rooted in Christ's sovereignty (Matt. 28:18), it could be said that provision for such testimony is included in the rite.

2. The bishop participates in the ministry of the prophets in his concern for the whole community's welfare, and in his public involvement in issues of justice, mercy, and truth. He should expect the support of his people in this ministry. If there is little indication of an apostolic succession in this rite, there is none at all of any prophetic succession. The bishop is told in the Examination preface that he is to promote the mission of the Church throughout the world, and it is difficult to understand how in the contemporary context the community's welfare in such issues as justice, mercy, and truth could be ignored. The new rite omits the traditional question concerning the bishop's obligation to the poor and needy, and there is no question in the Exami-

nation to compensate for its loss. The preface says that "he is to have a special care for the outcast and needy," but this particular responsibility is not emphasized with the strength found in the former rite and retained by RP even in its wholesale revision of its Examination as well as in the homily.

Apart from the "We do" assent of the people, there is nothing in the service to indicate that the bishop might expect any support from his people. The assent of the people is an addition to the CE rite, and so is to be commended, but the service is so designed that apart from the assent there is little opportunity for the laity to demonstrate liturgically their place with the bishop in the diocese. This is in part due to the fact that still in England bishops are generally not ordained in their cathedral churches but in the church of the metropolitan. The elect is still presented by other bishops; there is no rubric that requires lay readership of any lesson; the prayer of the faithful is to be led by the archbishop. In replying to objections to the exclusion of lay participation in all the services of ordination, Canon Cuming, chairman of the committee for revision of the Ordinal, had this to say:

After all, what we are doing at this point is separating some people from the laity. We are not making them into extra good laymen, but into deacons, priests and bishops, and quite early in our work we were warned that this was something to which the Roman Catholic Church attached great importance. Our early drafts were full of phrases like 'role of the priesthood' and so forth, but it was suggested to us by those who were in close contact that it would be sensible if we concentrated on making clear that we were only vesting priest by priest, and that is why the laity are not brought in more explicitly.

(General Synod Proceedings, VIII.2, p. 586)

This implies that the committee attached great importance to what some people thought Roman Catholics think. A closer reading of the new Roman rite (and certainly the pertinent Vatican II decrees) should have persuaded the committee to find other consultants. The ordination of the bishop is the first opportunity to illustrate in a dramatic and dynamic way the bond between bishop and people, and if the symbol be neglected we should not be surprised to find the reality fading away as well.

3. The bishop is to be the leader in the Christian community, but he is to be among his people as one who serves. "As a chief minister, he is to lead in serving and caring for the people," says the preface to the Examination. Phrases from the former rite are echoed in the new ordination prayer: "Give him humility, that he may use his authority to heal, not to hurt; to build up, not to destroy." "Through him increase your Church, renew its ministry, and unite its members in a holy fellowship of truth and love," says the same prayer. The bishop is to "accept the discipline of this Church and faithfully exercise authority within it" (Examination). And the preface states that he "is to be merciful, but with firmness, and to minister discipline, but with mercy," again incorporating language from the former rite. The leadership role of the bishop is firmly stated in this rite, and the servant role is applied no less clearly. The postcommunion sentence provides a closing emphasis on the serving function.

As in ECUSA and the 1549 BCP and its successors, it is the bishop as governor rather than as priest that is stressed. ECUSA has attempted

to draw more attention to the priestly image, but CE has elected to remain within the 1549 tradition quite firmly. The new CE rite for the ordination of priests emphasizes the various aspects of that office more explicitly than 1662 - the priest is to preach, absolve, baptize, preside at the Eucharist, bless, and teach, among other functions listed in the introduction to that Examination. As in ECUSA, he is "to work with the bishop ... as servant and shepherd." And also as in ECUSA, the bishop is seen not as the source of this priestly office, but as its leader and guide. He is "ruler over his household," as the consecratory prayer has it. In spite of divergences in liturgical and theological emphases, both of these churches in the Anglican communion are agreed in the difficulty they have in separating episcopate satisfactorily and distinctively from presbyterate except in terms of general supervision and the authority to ordain.

4. The bishop has an obligation of setting an example to his people. We have seen that this has been a key note in the Anglican Ordinal since 1549. The emphasis has not been diminished in this new rite, although its framework is slightly altered in the opening collect. Formerly the prayer was for the ordinand, that he might be adorned with innocence of life; now the elect is still prayed for, but the petition is that God would "adorn us with innocence of life, that each in his vocation and ministry may serve to the glory of your name" (emphasis mine). And in the Examination the bishop-elect is asked, "Will you fashion your own life and that of your household to be an example to the people of God?" Such an implication is also there in being "a faithful witness

to Christ to those among whom you live."

5. With the other bishops he has the responsibility of guardianship of the faith. The preface to the Declaration of Assent defines that faith as "uniquely revealed in the holy Scriptures and set forth in the catholic creeds, which faith the Church is called upon to proclaim afresh in each generation." The bishop-elect is required to declare his belief in that faith so defined, and then is asked about them again in the Examination. The Examination preface reminds him of his duty to guard the faith as a part of the special role he has with his fellow-bishops as a chief pastor. The ordination prayer asks that he be made steadfast as a guardian of the Church's faith, and finally he receives the Bible which he has earlier declared to be the source of revelation of the faith, and the staff as a sign of his duty to watch over the faith of the flock.

6. The bishop is to be a focus of unity, thus entailing that all the baptized should remain in communion with him, and that he is responsible for the pastoral role of healing divisions and maintaining and strengthening the fellowship of the Church. The preface to the Examination tells us that the bishop "is to sustain and further the unity of the Church," and he is asked if he will "promote unity, peace, and love among all Christian people." The ordination prayer asks that "through him members of the Church may be united in a holy fellowship." And he receives the pastoral staff with the admonition to "restore the lost, build up the body of Christ." All of these exhortations are active ones; the bishop is not merely a sign; he is to be a causal

factor in the Church's search for unity. It is well that bishops should be encouraged to think that they have a responsibility for Christian unity, and not be content simply to shepherd their portion of the flock. One can regret that episcopal collegiality is only referred to in this rite in terms of guarding the faith. We will refer to that again, but as far as unity is concerned there seems to be lacking in this Ordinal a sense that the bishop, by virtue of his office, is a focus of unity, the term used in the Lambeth reports. There is no indication that in his person and order he represents the unity of the diversity of gifts and graces showered by the Spirit upon the Church. Unity seems to be something to be achieved, rather than the gift of God, and the bishop is more responsible for making it happen than to be a sign of the gift. There may be a danger in saying in one sentence, as the preface to the Examination does, that "he is to maintain and further the unity of the Church, to uphold its discipline, and to guard its faith." It is not inconceivable that this may be read as finding unity only among those who will conform to one type of ecclesiastical discipline which has become equated with the faith and indistinguishable from it, and the only venture in ecumenicity is to say, "Let us be one. Come, join us."

The necessity for the baptized to remain in communion with the bishop is not referred to in this rite. Presumably it is understood to be necessary, and is implied when God is asked to "unite the Church's members in a holy fellowship through the ministry of the bishop." It might be well in a denomination that has looked upon the bishop as being more important for what he can do than for who he is that greater empha-

sis be laid upon the significance of the bishop in his diocese, and the responsibility of the faithful to gather around him. This might begin symbolically by making episcopal ordinations less "episcopal."

The rite does stress the importance of the bishop in his diocese and his responsibility to the faithful in it. He is "to lead in serving and caring for the people in the place where he is called to work" (Examination), "to watch over and pray for all those committed to his charge, and to teach and govern them" (Examination), "to know his people and be known by them" (Examination), "to promote unity, peace, and love ... especially among those committed to his charge" (Examination), "to be a faithful witness to Christ to those among whom he lives", and to lead his people to obey our Saviour's command to make disciples of all nations" (Examination), to unite the members of the Church and to rule over God's household (ordination prayer), and to "keep watch over the whole flock in which the Holy Spirit has appointed him to shepherd the Church of God" (presentation of the staff). But two things need to be observed about this. The first is that little is said about reciprocity. The people are to know the bishop and the bishop is to know them. There is nothing comparable to the requirement of consultation that finds a place in RP and ECUSA. CE may say nothing about the bishop as having the fullness of the priesthood, but it certainly implies that he has the plenitude of governing power. There is no sense conveyed that authority belongs to the entire Church and that the bishop is entrusted with it and is accountable to the Church for his use of it. The only accountability is "when the Chief Shepherd shall appear." The second

thing to be said is that this particular emphasis on the authority of the bishop in his diocese excludes all but one reference to the collegial nature of the episcopate, that having to do with guarding the faith. This is no doubt due to the historical and traditional Anglican dependence upon a Cyprianic theory of church government, but recent theological discussion such as we examined in the last chapter, plus the Anglican-Roman Catholic dialogue, as well as the obvious difficulties such a theory is creating for the entire Anglican communion, might have led to a greater concentration on the significance of those three bishops that the canons require to be present for the laying on of hands.

Finally, as we saw in ECUSA, great stress is laid upon the fact that it is the bishop who ordains. That function is isolated in the preface to the Examination and in the ordination prayer ("renew its ministry"). If there is any fullness of the priesthood in the episcopate it is only seen by this insistence upon the bishop as the source of ordination (see Canon 1 at the beginning of the CE rite). Despite any other differences in their two rites, ECUSA and CE are agreed on the episcopacy as the only valid means for valid ministry; the episcopal ministry is more important for what it does than for what it is.

THE LECTIONS IN EPISCOPAL CONSECRATION RITES

The five rites we have been examining can be divided into two categories relative to their use of scripture readings: those that demand a proper lesson designed to be used for that service alone with no substitutions or alterations allowed, and those that allow considerable flexibility in the choice of lessons. In the first group are CSI and CE. Of the other three RP provides the widest range of alternatives: two from the OT, eleven from Acts and the epistles, and thirteen from the gospels. In addition, the principal consecrator also has the option of using whatever lessons are proper to the Sunday or holy day on which the consecration is taking place, or he may mix them. ECUSA also provides for the use of the propers of the day in addition to two OT lessons, three from the epistles, and three from the gospels. COCU provides one OT lesson, three from Acts and the epistles, and three from the gospels.

COCU and RP allow for the same lessons (in some cases) to be read at the ordinations of both presbyters and bishops. The other rites keep the lessons separate. The distribution of lessons between the rites indicates how little agreement there is as to the appropriateness of any one lesson for any one order (see Appendix G). Isaiah 61, for example, may be used for presbyters and bishops in RP, for bishops only in ECUSA, and for presbyters only in CE and COCU. Acts 20, with its dual use of presbyteroi and episkopoi, may be used for presbyters and bishops in RP and COCU; CSI restricts it to episcopal consecration and omits the presbyteroi verse. I Peter 5:1-4 may be used in RP for either order; ECUSA restricts it to priests and specifies that "elder"

is to be read "presbyter."

The tendency to allow for a wide range of possible lessons indicates the recognition that it is not possible to justify any particular order on the basis of any one biblical passage to the exclusion of all others, and that the proper function of the lessons should be to allow the preacher opportunity to reflect upon the meaning of ministry as understood in scripture and its application to the life of the Church and the ordinand in the contemporary setting. RP appears to have appreciated this more than the other rites in our survey. Its list of lections for all the orders is included in the appendix to the rite (here. pp. 276-78), and all lessons are appropriate to any order unless specifically restricted. There is no restriction on any of the gospels, including John 20 and 21. Those may be used at the ordination of a deacon as well as a bishop, although in the other rites they are never permitted at a diaconal ordination. CE, on the other hand, has reduced the options in the episcopal consecration service from three in the former rite (John 21, John 20, Matt. 28) to the mandatory John 21. And John 20 becomes the mandatory lesson at the ordination of priests. Such a controlled approach implies that John 20 would not have an edifying word for the episcopal ordinand, and by removing both Matt. 9:36 and John 10 from the presbyteral service that the shepherding function is restricted to the bishop.

We shall now examine the possible options in each rite to see what they intend to say or imply about episcopal ministry, and to see what resources they contain for the one appointed to preach in the service.

This assumes that lessons are chosen not only to be read but to be the basis for the sermon which follows. Even RP, with its elaborate homily, provides that the instruction may be the work of the principal consecrator (although we have questioned the wisdom of restricting the sermon to him). None of the rites follow the pattern of the 1662 BCP where a sermon is tacked on to the end of Morning Prayer, and then the Communion begins with its separate epistle and gospel. The recognition that the reading of the lessons and the preaching of the word belong together is one area where the liturgical movement has made itself felt in a significant way.

CSI appoints Ezekiel 34:11-16 as the OT lesson at an episcopal consecration. The emphasis here is upon God as the shepherd of the flock. "I myself will be the shepherd of my sheep" (v. 15). The function of the bishop as pastor is to be modelled upon the divine example.

I will seek the lost, and I will bring back the strayed,
and I will bind up the crippled, and I will strengthen
the weak, and the fat and the strong I will watch over;
I will feed them in justice. (v. 16)

The formula at the delivery of the pastoral staff recalls the passage:

Feed the flock; hold up the weak; heal the sick, bind
up the broken, bring again the outcast, seek the lost.

The flock for which the bishop has responsibility is divided into three types: the lost and strayed, the crippled and weak, and the fat and strong. If the preacher wants to consider these in a line of descending priorities, then he must underscore the evangelical and missionary character of the episcopal office. This involves discussing the origi-

nal meaning of the apostle as "one sent," and the Christological implications. The passage also provides an opportunity to discuss the relation of the bishop to the "fat and strong." It might not be amiss to observe that if episcopal oversight is not exercised among this presumably self-sufficient portion of the flock they run the risk of re-entering the scene as the lost and strayed. That which unites the flock is the need for a common pasture where they will be fed in justice and righteousness. It is a justice ordered by God; it is God who justifies, and that is the word the bishop is to feed the hungry sheep. How the three categories are to be identified in any given diocese, and what justification is to mean to them and how it is to be made manifest will be the task of the preacher to determine.

The OT lesson is reinforced by the lesson for the Epistle, Acts 20: 28-35.

Take heed to yourselves and to all the flock, in which the Holy Spirit has made you guardians, to feed the church of the Lord... (v. 28)

This passage provides an opportunity to discuss the role of the Holy Spirit in the ordering of the Church's ministry, and it can be used to introduce the theme of mutuality ("yourselves and ... all the flock"). The role of the bishop as a guardian of the faith is emphasized in vv. 29-32. And the importance of personal example is a theme to be derived from vv. 33-35. The passage might be considered as a whole under the first verse of the lection by discussing the personal example (take heed to yourselves) and the importance of guarding the faith (and to all the flock).

The CSI gospel lection does not follow the shepherd imagery through with John 21, as might be expected. Instead, the choice is John 20, the giving of the Spirit. This relates to the lesson from Acts ("in which the Holy Spirit has made you guardians"). It may also relate back to the OT lesson if the preacher wishes to pursue the theme of being sent, since it is here that Jesus says, "As the Father has sent me, even so I send you." All three lessons might be related by discussing the divine example (OT) mirrored in the human example of the bishop (E) and made effective by the gift of the Spirit (G). Verse 23, concerning the remission of sins, would provide opportunity to discuss the priestly nature of the episcopate. The preacher should remember, however, that this passage is also used in presbyteral ordinations, and it would be unsound exegetically to lay stress on this verse as simply having to do with the episcopal office.

What does seem to be quite clear about the choice of lessons in CSI is that the episcopate is understood to be a shepherding or overseeing office that is based on God's concern for his people, and that the Holy Spirit is the source through which the bishop is able to minister to the needs of all the flock.

RP is surprising in the great number of lections provided for ordinations. The number is so large, and the use of the same lessons for all three orders so common, that it is not possible to discuss them in the same way we have just done for CSI in order to see what major themes are being emphasized for the episcopal office. Out of thirty-one lessons, only one is restricted totally to use at episcopal ordinations: II Tim.

1:6-14. An examination of that passage might, therefore, tell us something specifically about episcopacy in the Roman church. Paul, the presumed author, tells Timothy "to rekindle the gift of God that is within you through the laying on of my hands" (v. 6). Later, (v. 14) Timothy is instructed to "guard the truth that has been entrusted to you by the Holy Spirit who dwells within us." It would appear that the framers of RP saw the laying on of hands referred to as episcopal ordination. Timothy is to do that which first defined apostolic succession: "follow the pattern of sound words which you have heard." Episcopacy, then, is to be in descent from an apostle, having had committed to one the safeguarding of the truth of the gospel which the apostle taught. It is the Holy Spirit, however, and not the apostle (v. 14) who entrusts the bishop with the truth.

I Tim. 4:12-16 is permitted at any ordination, but if it is used at an episcopal ordination verse 12a is omitted ("Let no one despise your youth"). In this passage Paul speaks of the time "when the elders laid their hands upon you." Presumably that could not have been episcopal ordination, since in the next letter Paul speaks of when he laid hands upon Timothy. Whether Timothy is a bishop or a presbyter in the first letter would appear to be unimportant, since the instructions given are applicable to any order of the ministry. The laying on of hands of an apostle and the concern with the maintenance of truth in the second letter are seen as being particularly episcopal.

There are, then, twenty-six lessons listed for use at the ordination of bishops. Twenty-three of them could also be used at the ordination of

a deacon and twenty-five at the ordination of a priest. Clearly, the function of the lessons is not to define order, but to illustrate ministry. (Some are intended to relate to the function of an order, or are seen in the historical context as having some relationship, such as that of II Tim., as we just saw. Other examples would be Num. 3: 5-10a and Num. 11 for priests, or Acts 6:1-7a for deacons.) The two OT readings which might be used at an episcopal ordination have the twin emphases of the prophetic call and being sent. The descriptive sentence beside each citation has reference to being sent. Further, Isaiah lays great stress upon the social implications of the Good News, a stress in harmony with Christus Dominus.

The lessons from Acts and the epistles emphasize the call to witness to the saving acts of God in Christ (Acts 10:37-43), the function of oversight in the Church (Acts 20:17ff.), the differing gifts of ministry (Romans 12:4-8), the servant nature of ministry (II Cor. 4:1-2, 5-7), the ministry of reconciliation (II Cor. 5:14-20), the unifying nature of the ministry (Eph. 4), the high priesthood of Christ as the basis for all ministry (Heb. 5:1-10), and stewardship and shepherdhood in the ministry (I Peter 4 and 5).

In the same way, the gospels are designed to emphasize special aspects of ministry: servanthood, steward of the truth, people sent on mission. A glance at the official descriptive sentences in the appendix will make the point that it is ministry and not order that is the chief concern. The Church, for Rome, has under the inspiration of the Spirit established what the orders and their functions are. The purpose

of scripture is not, therefore, to justify the order, but to provide criteria for doing the work of ministry.

COCU follows CSI in using Ezekiel 34 for the OT lesson. It provides three options for the epistle, one being Acts 20, but unlike CSI the whole passage from v. 17 on is used. COCU also uses the same lesson as one of the epistle options at the ordination of presbyters. (One suspects that this is done to provide scriptural warrant for the vagueness about the orders that we discussed earlier in this chapter. RP can use the same passage in both services because it is not concerned to justify the order conferred.) The second option for the epistle is I Tim. 3:1-7, the description of the ideal bishop. Three functions are mentioned: practicing hospitality (v. 2), teaching (v. 2), and caring for the church (v. 5). The rest of the passage is concerned with the bishop's personal and moral qualifications, and stress is laid upon his reputation among those outside the faith.¹ The third option is II Tim. 4:1-5 with its emphasis upon the preaching ministry, sound teaching, and the need to be steadfast in suffering. The three options for the gospel allow an emphasis to be placed upon the preaching ministry (Matt. 28), the priestly ministry (John 20), or the pastoral ministry (John 21). A pastoral emphasis might be retained throughout by combining Ezekiel, Acts, and John 21. Or a balance might be struck by the use of the pastoral motif in Ezekiel, the teaching and preaching function in Timothy,

1. It might be observed here that RP does not provide for the use of this lesson at an episcopal ordination, but it does allow v. 8 ff. (about the office of deacon) for diaconal ordinations. Since both passages refer to the married state, one wonders whether or not 1-7 has been omitted because of the rule of celibacy for bishops and 8-13 allowed now that a married diaconate is permitted.

and the priestly function in John 20. In any event, it is clear that the framers of the COCU rite saw the advantages of providing lessons that would not restrict the preacher to too narrow a view of who a bishop is and what he does.

ECUSA follows RP in emphasizing in the OT lessons the theme of prophetic anointing rather than that of shepherding. This rite expands Isaiah 61 to include the first eight verses as opposed to RP's use of 1-3a. Such an expansion complicates the imagery, because 1-3a is spoken by the one who is anointed by the Spirit and it describes the burden of his message to the people, "to those who mourn in Zion." 3b-8 then describes what the results will be for those who hear the prophet's message. They "shall be called the priests of the Lord," and they will be spoken of "as the ministers of our God." The preacher will need to be careful not to confuse the anointed prophet with those who hear his message. If all eight verses are used, then it is important to point out that if the bishop is being referred to in 1-3a (by typology, of course), then it is the whole priestly people of God who are described in the following verses. The bishop is the one who in the power of the Spirit reveals their priestly nature to them. 1-3a certainly identifies the bishop with the ongoing ministry of Christ. The alternative OT lesson is Isaiah 42:1-9, the first four verses being the first of the Servant Songs. Again, the bishop is identified with the servant ministry of Jesus in those verses, and vv. 5-7 identify the work of servanthood with opening the eyes of the blind and bringing the prisoners from the dungeon, i.e., the specific social applications of the proclamation of the

Good News. Both lessons share the theme of being anointed by the Spirit, of continuing the ministry of Christ, and the social application of that ministry to human need.

ECUSA provides three options for the epistle. The first is Hebrews 5:1-10. While RP allows this for all three orders, thus providing an opportunity to discuss the priesthood of Christ as the source of all ministry, the Americans have restricted it to episcopal consecration. The preacher may certainly treat it in terms of its applicability to all ministry, but such a restriction implies, at any rate, that the intent is to emphasize the high priestly role of the bishop as a model of Christ. This would remedy the lack of specific mention of this role that we noted in the rest of the rite. The second option is I Tim. 3:1-7, which we have discussed under the COCU rite. It is the third option which provides a direct connection with either of the OT lessons. II Cor. 3:4-9 speaks of being "ministers of a new covenant, not in a written code but in the Spirit" (v. 6), and this might be used as a companion text with "I will make an everlasting covenant with them" (Is. 61:8) or with "I have given you as a covenant to the people" (Is. 42:6). The theme of the anointing of the Spirit also makes these companion texts.

The theme of the Spirit might then be carried through with the first of the gospel options, John 20:19-23, the gift of the Spirit. The second option is John 17:1-9, 18-21. This is part of the "high priestly prayer" of Jesus, and would serve as the companion gospel to the Hebrews lesson. The episcopal ministry as a continuation of the priestly ministry of Christ is underscored in v. 18: "As thou didst send me into the world,

so I have sent them into the world." This also provides an opportunity to discuss the apostolic nature of the office. The function of the bishop as teacher is present in the passage's emphasis on the truth and the prayer that "they also may be consecrated in truth." The prayer "that they may all be one" is in this lesson, and it might serve as a means of discussing the unifying role of the bishop. The third gospel option is Luke 24:44-49a, the Lukan parallel to the Great Commission. The bishop is seen as the custodian of the kerygma and the witness to the mighty acts of God in Christ. He is a teacher in descent from the apostles for whom Jesus "opened their minds to understand the scriptures" (v. 45). The concluding sentence, "I send the promise of my Father upon you," provides a touchstone with the anointing themes in the OT lessons and with the lesson from II Cor.

It should be noted that no lesson employs the motif of the shepherd. Although this theme was dominant in the former rite, it is now entirely absent from episcopal ordination and is restricted to the rite for presbyters. The major themes instead are the Spirit, preaching and teaching, and priesthood.

CE employs only three lessons with no provision for alternative choices. The OT lesson is Numbers 27:15-20,22-23, the commissioning of Joshua by Moses. The shepherd theme is present because Joshua was commissioned so "that the congregation of the Lord may not be as sheep which have no shepherd" (v. 17). The theme of authority coming from God is stressed here, and that authority is conveyed by the laying on of hands (v. 18). Joshua is chosen because he is "a man in whom is the Spirit"

(v. 18). The Spirit appears to be present prior to the laying on of hands; it is his presence that qualifies Joshua to be chosen and to receive the outward rite which confirms him in his post. The epistle is II Cor. 4:1-10. It acknowledges that though one has authority ("having this ministry") it is only exercised by means of the transcendent power of God. The authority is to make manifest in the body the life of Jesus. This text provides opportunity to speak of the bishop as the means by which Christ is present among his people, and so remedy a lack we have observed in the rite. The gospel is John 21, the commission to feed the sheep. Here the OT lesson is echoed, and we see that the authority is a servant's authority and the servant is (the epistle) accountable to and dependent upon the greater power of the Master.

Just as the American Anglicans have ignored the shepherd image, so the English Anglicans have ignored the priestly role in their choice of lessons. This illustrates the diversity now to be seen in the Anglican communion, and it justifies our use of the two rites to see what the two major lines of development will be: the Church of England cleaving to the Cranmerian heritage with an emphasis on the shepherd, and the American church deciding to follow the recent "catholic" trends and emphasizing the priestly nature of the episcopate. All other Anglican rites will tend to be derivative from these.

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

I shall attempt in this chapter to summarize the liturgical elements in these consecration rites that contribute to an understanding of the episcopal office and then to draw some conclusions about the meaning of the office today as reflected in the rites generally.¹

1. The Liturgical Evidence

1. With the exception of the South Indian rite, which reflects its earlier date, the tendency is to use the term "ordination" rather than "consecration" in the titles of the rites to describe what is happening in the service. COCU uses both terms in the title, putting "consecration" in parentheses, so even there "ordination" receives a preferred status. The intent of this appears to be to emphasize the distinct nature of the episcopate as a third order of ministry and to discourage theological speculation that it is merely a fullness of the presbyterate (something quite different in its implications than "fullness of priesthood"). "Consecration" is not an abandoned term, however, since participating bishops are referred to as "co-consecrators," and the accompanying prayer is called the prayer of consecration. RP and ECUSA have provided for more consistency in the use of terms in all three services, thus eliminating the ambiguity that is latent in the CE usage. Those two communions call all three services ordination, and the prayer in

1. The implications of each separate rite are found in the annotations and essays accompanying each rite in the previous chapter.

each service is called the consecration. Bishops are no more "consecrated" than are deacons, and they are as truly ordained. Rome is giving liturgical expression to the decision on the matter made at the Second Vatican Council; it is a reflection of an authoritative decree made by a General Council (from their perspective). The American Episcopalians are falling in line with current historical, theological, and liturgical scholarship, having no similar center of authority, and they appear to be hoping that by means of the liturgical influence the attitude will gain acceptance among their membership.

2. All of these ordination rites are set within the context of the Eucharist. This may seem natural to those churches that have long stressed the importance and centrality of Eucharistic worship, but for those that have not done so it will represent an important change.¹ Where the Eucharistic liturgy is properly celebrated it will make manifest the whole Church at work, participating in the commission to ministry, involving all the people in some fashion, and by exalting the servant Christ will provide a paradigm for ministry. Even the Roman church, where the celebration of mass was always a part of the rite, has worked to correct that attitude which made the celebration a thing tacked on, and the movement of the newly-ordained bishop to the altar to preside at the Eucharist now becomes the climax of the service, for there he is seen in the role for which he was ordained - to be high priest to his

1. American Methodists, as we have mentioned, have always used the 1662 Ordinal, but they have done so without appearing to understand that the services are intended to be part of a Eucharistic celebration. They simply read through collect, epistle, and gospel, and then proceed to the consecration, after which the service is over.

people, surrounded by his episcopal colleagues, assisted by his presbyters, supported by his deacons, and offering the gifts of his people. The Accra document has expressed well the importance of this Eucharistic centrality:

A long and early Christian tradition places ordination in the context of worship and especially of the eucharist. Such a place for the service of ordination preserves the understanding of ordination as an act of the whole community, and not of a certain order within it or of the individual ordained. Even if one believes that the act of ordaining belongs to a special order within the Church, it is always important to remember that the entire community is involved in the act.... By placing ordination in the context of worship and especially the eucharist, this act is referred to God himself and the ordained person is dedicated to the service of 'his Servant' who offers himself for the salvation of the world. (Par. 49)

3. Quite apart from the lay participation that is necessary for any properly celebrated Eucharist, the new rites tend to provide a more prominent place for the laity as an integral part of the ordination rite itself, CE being the only exception. The move to lay participation is not uniform, but generally reflects positive movement in each communion from the position accorded the laity earlier. RP insists that the service should be performed in such a way that it is visible and intelligible to all the congregation. ECUSA includes lay persons among the presenters, and COCU includes them in the imposition of hands, thus signifying that the ministry is inherent in all the people regardless of the rite conferred. All the rites have restored the acclamation, the people's expression of their approval of the candidate. The presence of the acclamation implies that the people have a responsibility in the choosing

of their chief minister and that his ministry is in response to their call and election. Vox populi vox Dei might not be an inappropriate description of the significance of this part of the service, for, if the popular function is only to be a rubber stamp it becomes a blasphemous addition to the liturgy, and if it has significance it must then be rooted in the ministerial authority which is common to all the baptized people of God. It must remain possible for those present, after the reading of the Apostolic Mandate or the Royal Warrant, to declare that they represent a majority of the diocese and are opposed to the continuation of the service because it contradicts the will of the people who will be served. If such is not possible, then the re-introduction of the acclamation is simply a piece of historical-liturgical antiquarianism and should be dispensed with. But if it does have meaning, that meaning is that pope, queen's ministers, or electors make the choice of a bishop only by the sufferance of the whole people and not through any right of their own.¹

4. There is an increased emphasis on the collegiality of the episcopate, an understanding that the new bishop is not merely being inducted as head of a diocese, but he is also being incorporated into a larger

1. It may be that the acclamation along with the Peace has encountered the greatest amount of resistance among the laity because they recognize liturgical fictions when they see them, in spite of what some liturgical scholars might think. Are those elements in the service because they accurately reflect the experience of the contemporary worshiping congregation, or are they there because they were appropriate in the past and represent a kind of wishful thinking for the present? It may be claimed that the Peace, over the years, can make real what now it only represents, but can the same be said for the ordination acclamation? Its inclusion represents a potential threat to any bishop-making person or group.

body that shares in the government and guidance of the whole Church. All the rites insist upon the presence of three consecrators, in conformity with historic tradition since the decree of Nicaea which required it, but the tendency now is to move beyond that bare number in order to visualize more fully what that decree had in mind - the concurrence of the whole episcopate in the ordination as a sign of the unity of the Church. All the bishops present are encouraged to participate in the imposition of hands, and the ECUSA Examination provides them a share in the asking of the questions. Insistence on episcopal concelebration of the Eucharist is also designed to show that the new bishop share in his priesthood with the other members of the episcopal order, and his "validity" comes in terms of his continued communion with them all. This emphasis in the Roman church is the result of the decree of Vatican II on the episcopate and its relation to the pope and the whole Church. Among the Anglicans it seems to be the result of the need to find a source of unity in a time when radical disagreements and divisions are multiplying. Again, the Roman liturgy reflects what the Council decided should be; the Anglican liturgies seem more to be a wistful hope for what they would like to be.

5. All the rites are agreed that ordination is a response to the proclamation of the word. Even when the formal presentation precedes the Service of the Word (as in ECUSA), the Examination and consecration follow after. Thus the Church's ministry is the result of the Good News, and is produced by the gospel for the sake of spreading the gospel. All the rites include three lessons: Old Testament (except, for RP, in

Eastertide), Epistle, and Gospel. This indicates the influence of biblical theology on the liturgy in Rome as well as in the Protestant community. The major difference has to do with the range of readings permitted. RP provides the greatest number of options, and the focus of the lessons is on the theme of ministry generally rather than, as the other rites appear to do, to try to justify a particular order on the basis of scripture alone. It would seem that the Romans have taken biblical scholarship at this point more seriously than have the Protestants. Nothing is said about the content of the sermon to be preached at an episcopal ordination, and it is interesting to note that RP, while providing greater flexibility in lessons, has alone also provided an extensive homily outlining in great detail the meaning and work of the bishop. The other rites usually include such a description in the preface to the Examination. Since, as we observed in Chapter I, ministry in the New Testament is a ministry involving all the people of God, the entire baptized community, the preacher would do well to avoid trying to apply specific gospel passages as though they were intended only for bishops. All the people are present, and the words of the gospel are for them. The call to ministry is directed to them, and the ordination service should provide an opportunity for them to renew their own dedication to their vocation and ministry. The part of the sermon directed to the ordinand should have to do with how his particular ministry relates to the Church's total ministerial commission. The use of the laity in reading two of the three lessons also serves to emphasize their place in the proclamation of the word which calls out and sepa-

rates for service a representative ministry.

Mention should be made of the place played by the Bible (or the Book of Gospels) in these rites. It is only in the Roman rite and CSI that there is provided a formal entrance for the scriptures at the beginning of the service. In RP, after the imposition of hands and before the consecratory prayer, the chief consecrator places the Gospels on the head of the elect, and the book is held there above his head by two deacons during the prayer. This shows that the Gospel is pre-eminently the episcopal burden (onus) he is called to bear. He is ordained in response to the word; he is ordained in the shadow, as it were, of the word; and finally the Gospel are given to him with the command to preach. The threefold action is to hear, to bear, and to share. The other rites have omitted the placing of the book above the head of the bishop-elect, even temporarily, or as a "catholic" option.¹

In the other rites the Bible plays no part until after the consecration, and in COCU not at all. It is instructive to compare the formulae employed at the delivery. In CSI the newly ordained is told, "Take this, a token of the authority which you have received to be a Bishop in the Church of God." How the Bible is a token of that authority is not made clear, but the implication at any rate is that authority to govern the Church is derived from the Word of God. The rest of the formula indicates that the Bible is to provide the basis for the bishop's teaching

1. This might partly be excused by the insistence of the other rites on uniting form and matter, a point we shall examine later. It is difficult to lay on hands with a book in the way! The other ancient custom, however, of placing the book upon the bishop's neck or shoulders would surely not be lacking the same significance and would meet the physical difficulties involved.

and all his actions. It is, then, the source of authority and the guide for teaching and leadership. The RP formula is "Receive the Gospel and preach the word of God..." It is the source of doctrine and the basis for belief. The ECUSA formula is "Receive the Holy Scriptures. Feed the flock of Christ ... and defend them in his truth, and be a faithful steward of his holy Word and Sacraments." Again the emphasis is on the preaching and teaching role of the bishop, with the addition that the Scriptures also signify the sacramental burden. But they are essentially the source of teaching, not of authority in a governmental sense. In the CE rite the ordinand is told, "Receive this Book; here are words of eternal life. Take them for your guide, and declare them to the world." Once more the emphasis is upon the scriptures as a guide for right teaching and action, not the source of episcopal authority. RP, by allowing for wide variety in lessons and by the symbolism of the overshadowing of the Gospels, manage to convey the impression of authority given through the totality of the scriptural witness as it has been received by the Church; the other rites, by restricting the lessons to be used and omitting this particular symbol, are liable to the judgment that they want specific lections to say more than they may about the episcopal office, and they are reluctant to find authority for episcopal ministry on the basis of what the whole word has to say about the whole ministry.

6. In order to illustrate the function of the bishop as guardian of the faith, the Creed has received prominence in all the rites except RP, where the Creed is ordered to be omitted altogether (rubric 12).¹

1. This is not because the Romans do not value the Creed, obviously;

CSI and CE follow the traditional pattern of reciting the Creed after the sermon as a summary statement of the major articles of the faith which the bishop is called upon to defend and which grow out of the witness of the scriptures, a portion of which has been previously read. COCU has the recitation of the Creed immediately following the Doxology which is sung as a thanksgiving after the consecration. In this place it unites the new bishop and his people in a common declaration of faith which together they will live out and proclaim before the world. ECUSA has adopted a tradition from the Eastern Church and requires the elect to lead the people in the Creed following his Examination and prior to the consecration as a sign that he has been "chosen to be a guardian of the Church's faith." The contrast between the RP usage (or non-usage) and that of the other rites is striking. RP has removed almost all of the old portion of the service which was intended to make explicit the orthodoxy of the bishop. A long and elaborate series of questions about the doctrine of the Trinity has vanished. The elect is now simply asked if he will guard the deposit of faith. It would appear that this practice points to the Roman assurance about possession of the deposit, so there is no need to intrude a didactic element into the service. The lack of a doctrinal authority in the other communions, and the theological diversity which characterizes their membership, has compelled them to

rather it is because they remember that the Creed is a late arrival on the liturgical scene and is expendable in the interests of time or for whatever reasons. Interestingly enough, it is the churches in the Protestant tradition that tend to be most insistent on the use of a creed (of whatever description) in public worship; in Roman practice the Creed is only required on Sundays and major holy days, presumably when a large number of the faithful will be present to profit by it.

place greater emphasis on the guardianship of the faith (something not ever mentioned as such in the older Anglican rites), and to use the Creed, itself subject to a great variety of interpretation, as the central symbol of what that faith is. The bishops must use the Creed as the symbol of the Church's faith, but they are not told how the Creed is to be explained. It is, then, difficult to know just exactly what it is that they are called upon to guard.

7. Perhaps the most significant single result of liturgical and historical research is seen in that all the rites have moved from an imperative mode in the consecration to a precatory form. As Canon Cuming explained to the General Synod of the Church of England:

The idea of what is called 'the imperative formula' - 'Receive the Holy Spirit' - only came in in the 11th or 12th century and is closely associated with mediaeval theories of transmission of the episcopal orders. We liturgists tend to regard anything that has been in the service for only 700 years as an innovation which needs a lot of justification, but we feel very confident that we are on the right lines at this point.

(G.S. Proceedings, VIII.2, p. 569)

The real influence was the discovery of the Hippolytean prayer and the realization that in the earliest form of consecration we have the Holy Spirit was invoked and not, in effect, ordered about. Only RP and ECUSA have used Hippolytus, but the other rites have followed the pattern of praying for the Spirit to bring his gifts and graces for episcopal ministry into the life of the ordinand. But to be content with the historical argument is not really sufficient, it seems to me. That leaves one open to the chance that someone will find a pre-Hippolytean rite that is imperative, and the liturgists will have to scurry around and do yet

another revision. To pray for the Spirit is more in keeping with the attitude of humble trust and faith that should characterize the Church. It indicates the Church's total dependence upon God's faithfulness in answering prayer and providing for the needs of his people. It has been the fault of the impression that the Holy Spirit must of necessity fall upon those on whom certain hands have been laid and over whom certain formulae uttered that has created the arrogant pretensions that characterize some approaches to apostolic succession. If the doctrine of apostolic succession is to have vitality (as well as "validity"), it must be seen as a sign of God's faithfulness and his ability to bridge the gap. The Church must learn to say not that because we have apostolic succession we have bishops, but rather, because God has given us bishops we are confident that he has given us apostolic succession. This is possible for the praying Church; I doubt whether it is possible for the "imperative" Church.

8. All the rites but RP combine the matter (imposition of hands) and form (prayer for the Holy Spirit). There seems to be no reason why one style should be preferred over another. Either can be staged effectively.¹ Both meet the requirements of ordination "with prayer and the laying on of hands." Yet I think there is something to be desired in RP.

The separation of the two makes manifest both the human and the divine

1. I make no apology for using the term "staged" here. It seems contradictory to me to talk on the one hand about the "drama of the liturgy" and on the other act as though choreography were of no importance. If services are now being scheduled to allow for the presence of greater numbers of people, people who in our culture are accustomed to the influence of visual impact, those who have the responsibility for arranging services should not fail to appreciate the need to communicate through all the senses.

operations in the ordination. The imposition of hands is the commissioning in the human order; it is the Church's way of saying that this individual is to walk among us as shepherd and guide. It means that his gifts and graces have been recognized by the Church as those suitable for episcopal office. The prayer then offers that choice to God and asks for his ratification by the seal of the Spirit. The Church acknowledges that by herself she is not sufficient to make such a choice; "our sufficiency is from God" (CSI and COCU). The combination of the form and matter seems more appropriate to the imperative formula. The former Roman rite, at the time of the imposition, had each bishop say "Receive the Holy Spirit" as he laid on hands. It is instructive that that has now been omitted, and hands are laid on in silence. Combining form and matter might seem to say, "Because we are laying on hands, send down your Holy Spirit," and so reinforce a magical interpretation of what is happening in ordination. It is, of course, the two together that are necessary for the ordination. In RP the ordinand is still referred to as the electus after he has received the imposition of hands, and the former rite, even with the formula uttered at the imposition, understood that the forma consecrationis episcopalis was properly in the consecratory prayer. So a separation of the matter and form (in that order) does emphasize the human and divine elements each at work in the service, and underscores the role of the Church as the people of God who trust in him to provide for their needs in answer to the prayer of faith. It demonstrates that God is the principal Consecrator and Agent of ordination.

9. There has been a restoration of the porrectio instrumentorum among the non-Romans, and the RP has reformed its practice in the delivery of the instruments. The Anglicans, from 1651 on, had retained only the delivery of the Bible. CSI restored the presentation of the staff with an accompanying formula, and so has CE. ECUSA provides for "other symbols of office" to be given, but has no formula for them. Its rubrics speak of "a ring, staff, and mitre, or other suitable insignia of office." In that tradition a pectoral cross is often included. COCU makes even the giving of a Bible optional, but allows for it as well as "some other appropriate symbol," and suggests "the need for creative thinking about those symbols which will signify the functions of the offices to the modern world." The mind reels in contemplation of what this might produce.

The RP reformation has included removing the blessing of the insignia to a time outside the service, thus de-emphasizing them and making it more difficult to identify them with something essential to the rite. The delivery of the gloves has been omitted altogether, delivery formulae have been shortened, and the miter is now presented in silence.

It is the Bible (or Gospels) and staff which all these services have in common. The two-fold emphasis, therefore, is on teaching (or preaching) and leadership (or, by extension from having received the Bible, guardianship of the faith). None of the traditional instruments relate to priesthood or indicate that the bishop is pre-eminently the high priest of the diocese. RP compensates for this in the anointing prior to the porrectio with the statement that "God has brought you to

share in the high priesthood of Christ" (Deus, qui summi Christi sacerdotii participem te effecit). The other rites, even ECUSA, which has followed the Roman lead more closely than other Anglican revisions, make no attempt to emphasize the high priestly function of the episcopate through the insignia.

2. Conclusions and Considerations

On the basis of this examination of the ordination rites, I submit the following general conclusions and observations.

1. The Roman church has the most clearly formulated description of the episcopal office in the documents of Vatican II, and her ordination rite is a reflection of those theological statements. The two are companion pieces. The suggested homily in the rite is a précis of the major teachings of the Council on the subject of episcopacy in Lumen Gentium and Christus Dominus. The official theology has produced the official liturgy. This is at variance with the tradition which maintains that theology is produced and conditioned by the liturgy, yet does not seem to me to be a strong argument against what the Romans have done. No liturgy ever develops on its own without being a result of theological reflection, and then in turn it serves to provoke more reflection. Whether or not one agrees with the result, the Romans are to be commended in marshalling their theological, historical, and biblical resources in order to define more clearly the place episcopal ministry is to have in the modern world and its relation to the whole people of God. They were able to do this because they have a system of authority which allows for the

promulgation of dogma and a theory of the development of doctrine which does not bind them to any particular expression which may have been articulated in the past. The result is that their bishops are able to operate with a fuller sense of identity, knowing who they are in the Church, why they are there, what makes them unique in the economy of salvation, and why they need not be concerned about the theological disputes of the past over the nature of the episcopal order. If Peter spoke through Leo at Chalcedon, thus providing future popes with a foundation on which to lay claim to universal jurisdiction, it might be said that at the Second Vatican Council the other members of the apostolic college spoke through the episcopal college and so provided the bishops with a fresh sense of the dignity, importance, and independence of their order.

I do not mean to imply that the Council answered all the questions about the meaning and scope of episcopal ministry. Many questions were avoided and left to the continuing theological debate. There is still much ambiguity left unresolved about the relation of the bishops to the papacy. Episcopal independence may still be a paper lion when the chair of Peter is occupied by a man of courage and determination who understands the uses of power.¹

1. As I write this, the religious press has been reporting John Paul II's Maundy Thursday (1979) address to the clergy and his letter to the bishops instructing them to see that his teaching about celibacy and the indissoluble nature of the priestly vows be observed. According to Time (Vol. 113, No. 17, Apr. 23, 1979), in 15 years Paul VI granted 31,324 requests for laicization out of 32,357, and in his first seven months John Paul has refused all of the over 300 requests he has received. If the bishop is the head of his clergy (L.G. 28), why does the Vatican reserve to itself the right to dispense from priestly vows?

The theological statements and the ordination rite are quite clear, however, about the bishop having the fullness of order, his unique high priestly status in the diocese, his succession in the episcopal college to the apostolic college, and the pre-eminence of his pastoral and teaching authority.

2. The other rites we have examined reflect the theological confusion about the episcopate that has existed since Jerome and are symptomatic of the identity crisis of the episcopacy in those churches. There is no means in those bodies to "update the doctrine" except by arriving at a general consensus over a long period of time, and the result then is usually on the basis of the practice and usage that has developed rather than because of any clearly articulated dogma. "The Church of England has bishops because the Church in England has always had bishops," and from that theologians are free to add the supports of scripture, tradition, and dogmatics. "Many of our uniting churches (in whatever union being contemplated) have maintained an episcopal order which we believe can be used for the good of the new united church, and therefore we will incorporate episcopacy into our structure," and the designers of such a united church then cull the historical evidence and theological documents to draft a job description that will create an episcopacy that resembles what the churches have known in the past, but which will not offend the traditions of the presbyterians and congregationalists who will also participate in the merger. The rites which result tend to be characterized by a combination of (1) a Cyprianic understating of episcopacy, (2) an attempt to incorporate the results

of recent biblical, historical, and liturgical research about the development of episcopacy, (3) a catalog of functions that seem necessary and plausible for the twentieth century Church, (4) a vagueness of definition designed to offend as few as possible but allow for diverse theological interpretations, and (5) the concept of ruler and leader with a democratic exegesis of the "priesthood of all believers."

The result of such a combination is that bishops end up basically as necessary mechanisms for ordination. The Roman rite never mentions ordination clearly and specifically; it is always singled out for special mention in the other rites.

These rites are designed with the hope that they will be productive of a theological understanding about the place of the episcopate in the Church. But their incorporation of such diverse elements will hardly guarantee any consensus emerging, just as it has not emerged in the Church of England, although that church has had as its cement the magnificent compromise of the Book of Common Prayer for four hundred years.

Bishops in these denominations will have to justify their existence not because they have the support of a theological system primarily, but by the effectiveness of the exercise of their individual ministries. It must be a truly charismatic ministry, characterized by courageous and prophetic preaching, certainty and clear-mindedness in providing leadership, and a compassionate and pastoral understanding of the needs of clergy and laity. A right reverence for bishops will have to be earned, not transmitted. The influence of such bishops will then give a meaning to the ordination rites that of themselves they are not able to convey

because they reflect such confusion and ambiguity.

3. The "common denominator" functions of episcopacy, those that appear in all the rites, are two - teaching and governing. Of those, governing is paramount, being reinforced by the use of the shepherd image and the symbol of the pastoral staff. The governing authority is absolute in the Roman church (except, of course, in those matters which are reserved to the Holy See); in the other communions "the governing (princely) Spirit of the Hippolytean prayer must function within the context of synodical government and the democratic ethos. The bishop becomes the executive arm of the church, responsible for seeing that the acts of the legislative arm are carried out.

Most of the rites make much of the bishop as "guardian of the faith," and that presupposes a role not only as teacher but as the definitive teacher within the people of God. Lumen Gentium emphasizes this role, placing it alongside the papal magisterium, and insisting that the bishops share with the pope in his infallibility by virtue of their joint membership in the episcopal college. That sharing is radically conditioned, however, by the statement that the pope may act on his own initiative for the whole college. In the other communions there is no channel by which the bishops may teach authoritatively on any basis other than their own moral influence. The Lambeth Conference is purely consultative; on the matter of merger with the Methodists and the ordination of women, the Church of England has declined to listen to the teaching of a majority of its bishops; the COCU Plan of Union makes clear that should that body come into being the bishops would not be

allowed to speak in the name of the Church without the consent of the legislative arm. The bishops in ECUSA have agreed to disagree on the ordination of women, with the result that some will and others will not ordain them. At the time that their new liturgy makes much of them as signs of unity, their very practice is much more demonstrable of their lack of unity and inability to agree on what constitutes matters of faith. So again it is the individual moral influence of the bishops, their charisma, which will make them respected as teachers, and not the office they hold.

We must conclude that Cyprianism, as embodied in classical Anglicanism and in those ecumenical groups influenced by Anglicans, has failed to work. The bishops' ability to govern is increasingly circumscribed, and as guardians of the faith they represent not the unity of the Church but its disarray. And regardless of the lip service paid by Vatican II to the teaching authority of the bishops, that communion has recognized that unity of teaching can only be obtained with the aid of papal cement, so that the only independence their bishops have is the freedom to agree with the Roman magisterium.

4. On the ecumenical scene, episcopacy must be content with a symbolic function, regardless of what real power may be committed to it by the Church in its executive capacity. The COCU and Accra documents make it clear that episcopacy is not to be seen as the esse of the Church, and the confusion and disagreement that has existed within Anglicanism over the relation between bishop and presbyter (and the more recent Anglican compromise about episcopacy as the plene esse) will prevent them

from making more than moderate claims in ecumenical discussions. The symbol of unity may be more real on the ecumenical level, but it will be symbolic of what the different traditions have attained together under the guidance of the Spirit, thus resulting in a unity of which the bishop is a living sign to the present of what has happened in the present. He cannot be a sign of a unity that has been preserved in faith and worship from the beginning. For the success of the ecumenical movement it will also be important that the episkope which existed in non-episcopal churches prior to merger be recognized as "valid" and legitimate and not be relegated to a second-class status. The bishops will only be recognized as legitimate to the degree that other forms are admitted as having been and being legitimate modes used by God to exercise governance in his Church. The bishop will be a "representative minister" not only of the present community, but of the integrity of all that which went before. It may be possible in that sense to say that he represents the "fullness of order," but certainly not that he contains that fullness. He may be a mirror which focuses the light of faith and unity, but he does not shed that light; it comes to him from the ministry committed to the whole baptized community.

5. The effort to exalt the bishop as the high priest will continue to be a theological exercise, and will only have meaning for those engaged in that task. The immediacy to the people in things priestly and pastoral which was surrendered to the presbyterate will not be regained, even in Rome. We have seen the clear historical and liturgical evidence that presbyters became what bishops had been, and only to that degree is

the designation of the bishop as high priest (or, more accurately perhaps, arch-presbyter) not far off the mark. It is too late for the bishops to expect to have returned to them in the twentieth century what they gave up in the sixth, and I must confess that I suspect that the return to the Hippolytean rite and the attempt to define the bishop in terms that the popular mind now applies to the parish priest is more the result of historical romanticism than it is of a realistic appraisal of the historical and theological developments. Even the Roman rite, with its very clear distinction now between bishop and presbyter, falters at the point of making that distinction clear in the vernacular. The decision quoted in the note on p. 245 makes one wonder how seriously the distinction is actually being taken, and it would indicate that it is not intended to be taken seriously by the faithful at all.

6. The theological documents examined in Chapter Three and the rites examined in Chapter Four tend to fall into two categories in their understanding of the episcopal office and ministry. One, represented best by the Roman statement, sees the episcopate ontologically. It is a part of the divine ordering of the Church on earth without which the community of faith would be radically incomplete if it existed at all. By virtue of episcopal consecration a man becomes unique in the economy of salvation, an indispensable dispenser of the true faith and guardian of the purity of the word and the integrity of the sacraments. Without him the sacraments cannot be (except possibly baptism), and the guarantee of the apostolic purity of the gospel is lost. The other category is pragmatic and functional. Bishops are there because they are needed

for ordination (and possibly confirmation) as the guarantors of a ministerial succession to the apostles effected only by the imposition of those hands, and because someone is needed to provide executive oversight of the work of all the churches. The image of the bishop as shepherd, priest, and ruler is common to both usages, although how they are understood and employed will vary widely.

One image that is never employed in the rites and is only mentioned in passing in the Lambeth Preparatory Articles and nowhere else in the material that is current, is that contained in the root meaning of a word still widely used to refer to things episcopal - pontifical.

Its origins are pagan, and the word itself has ponderous overtones, both of which may account for its being ignored, but its root image, the bridge builder (ponti-fex), might help in discovering some new ways of understanding the purpose of episcopacy in the twentieth century. The building of bridges is still an understood and important work today when shepherds seem a distant rural and fading phenomenon in our urban culture, when priests are associated with the manipulation of the divine (and diabolic), and when rulers are generally suspect as regards their motivation and ability to get anything accomplished in an increasingly complex and inter-related industrial and social structure. But most people still understand why bridges are built: to get from one place to another across an obstacle which would make such a passage otherwise impossible. Three applications of the image will cover the general list of episcopal functions that have been described in the rites.

(1) a bridge between God and people: This is the essence of priestly ministry, facilitating the meeting between God and his children for whom he yearns, between the soul and its creator. The bishop bridges the gulf by his priestly intercession, his identification with his people, his preaching, and his teaching. The Roman rite says this when it states that Christ, in the bishop, is present in the midst of his people. This is implied whenever the bishop is spoken of as a teacher and a steward of the mysteries of God. It means that the bishop must be, in Quick's term, a "sacramental man," carrying in his person God's identification with humanity while reflecting at the same time a depth of spirituality that comes from living in reliance on the grace of God. This may lead to a radical change in the actual work the bishop does (as opposed to the ideal job descriptions of the ordination rites), as well as a change in the qualifications he must have to merit the post. It was obvious from the Lambeth report that the bishops were particularly burdened by the administrative demands of their positions and the committee mentality of the modern corporation. It may now be necessary to ask whether bishops are administrators in the modern Church because that is integral to their task, or are they doing that work because it was done in the past by their predecessors who were at that time the only individuals qualified to do it. Is episcopal oversight merely the equivalent of being a managing director? Is it important that the bishop be a member of the board of trustees of every major institution in his diocese, and chairman of many of them? Does that kind of activity actually prevent the bishop from closer identification with his people? The qualification

for such a bridge builder is easily expressed in the question, "Can he tell the people about God in such a way that they will hear him gladly?" Actualization will not come as easily. Not without prayer and fasting.

(2) a bridge between the past and the present: The bishop is not only a sacramental man; he is also an apostolic man. He does personify the Church's history of saints and sinners, and he stands between the times with his arms in the form of a cross - one arm pointing to where we have been, another to where we are going. Because he is apostolic he is also eschatological. God in Christ has promised to be with his Church until the end of time, and the presence of the bishop is the sign of God's faithfulness to that promise. The defenders of a legalistic, tactile succession only concentrate on one arm of the cross, and they fail to see that the bishop is equally in an apostolic succession not simply because of his history but also because of the Church's future, the future of the whole people of God. The bishop is apostolic not because of his relation to the past, but because God, going before us into the future, guarantees that future. The presence of the episcopate should be a corrective to realized eschatology because its continuance signifies that we are still a pilgrim people, a "wonderful and sacred mystery," and that, in the words of the ECUSA collect, "things which were cast down are being raised up, and things which had grown old are being made new, and that all things are being brought to their perfection." As a builder of bridges between past and present, the bishop is called in his teaching and preaching ministry to show how God has acted in the drama

of salvation, and to make that past relevant in the present by providing leadership into the future. This may involve courageous breaks with the practices of the past in order to maintain the principles which are eternal. This will provide ample opportunity for the episcopal exercise of the prophetic ministry which was so heartily endorsed by Lambeth but which is never mentioned in the ordination rites.

(3) a bridge between people: The ministry of reconciliation must involve more than bridging the gap between God and humanity, as the Johannine epistles make clear. It must be applied to the relationships that exist between all isolated and estranged individuals and groups. The bishop's pastoral role must to a large extent be occupied in the work of mediation between diverse groups within his diocese, not only those of different theological opinions but also those in the secular society - labor and management, Catholic and Protestant, black and white, rich and poor. Perhaps the most difficult of all episcopal tasks is to identify with all the people in their prejudices and extremes without endorsing any of them. He must be an adept listener, a careful asker of questions, and his own faith in the redemptive love of God must be such that it can risk being made vulnerable to misunderstanding for the sake of helping people share that love. He is to be an enabler of dialogue rather than a last court of appeal expected to decide for one party or the other.

As a bridge between God and people, a priest and teacher; as a bridge between past and future, a prophet and preacher; as a bridge between people, a pastor and administrator. These seem to be the important

categories for the modern bishop. Obviously they are not the work of the bishop alone. They belong to the whole people of God. But the bishop is the incarnation of that ministry, a focus of it on behalf of the whole Church. It is interesting that episcopal ministry is not discussed in the material we have had under review as being incarnational. Yet, for a faith that is set in history, that believes that God acts in history through persons, and that he acted in a decisive manner in the Incarnation, it would seem only natural to expect that the ministry committed to all the Church should find incarnational expression. The bishop personifies for the whole Church what the whole Church's ministry should be. He does not perform that ministry alone, but by observing what he does and listening to what he says, all the company of the faithful find direction for what they should be doing, each "in his vocation and ministry." If the bishop has "fullness of order" it is because he is a channel for and reflection of all those gifts of ministry poured by the Spirit upon all the people, and under the bishop's leadership they are enabled to coordinate, share, ratify, and celebrate each other's ministry. For this reason he is the servus servorum Dei.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. LITURGICAL TEXTS

The Book of Common Worship as Authorised by The Synod 1962, London 1963
(Church of South India)

Cuming, G.J., ed., Hippolytus: A Text for Students, Bramcote, Notts. 1976

Dix, G., ed., The Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition, London 1937

The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI, London. 1960

The Ordination of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, n.p. 1977
(Church in Wales)

The Ordination of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons (Prayer Book Studies 20),
New York 1970

Ordination Services: A Report by the Liturgical Commission of the General
Synod of the Church of England, London 1977

A Plan of Union for the Church of Christ Uniting, Princeton, N.J. 1970

Pontificale Romanum, Vatican City 1968

Porter, H.B., Jr., ed., The Ordination Prayers of the Ancient Western
Churches, London 1967

The Proposed Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments
and Other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church Together with The Psalter
or Psalms of David According to the use of The Episcopal Church, New
York 1977 (This became the authorized book October 1979.)

The Rites of Ordination and Episcopal Consecration, Washington, D.C. 1967
(the former Roman Catholic rite)

The Roman Pontifical, Washington, D.C. 1975 (the official English trans-
lation of the new Roman Catholic rite)

Wilson, H., ed., The Pontifical of Magdalen College, London 1910

II. LITURGICAL STUDIES

Baumstark, A., Comparative Liturgy, London 1958

Blunt, J.H., ed., The Annotated Book of Common Prayer, 2 vol., London 1866

- Bradshaw, P., The Anglican Ordinal, London 1971
- Brightman, F.E., The English Rite, 2 vol., London 1921
- Clarke, W., ed., Liturgy and Worship, London 1933
- Duchesne, L., Christian Worship, London 1903
- Frere, W., The Principles of Religious Ceremonial, London 1928
- Harmon, N., Jr., The Rites and Ritual of Episcopal Methodism, Nashville 1926
- Jones, C., et al., ed., The Study of Liturgy, London 1978
- Jungmann, J., The Mass of the Roman Rite, London 1961
- Keeling, W., Liturgiae Britannicae, London 1842
- Panikkar, R., Worship and Secular Man, London 1973
- Sansom, M., Liturgy for Ordination: The Series 3 Services, Bramcote, Notts. 1978
- Shepherd, M., Jr., The Oxford American Prayer Book Commentary, New York 1950
- Toon, P., The Ordinal and its Revision, Bramcote, Notts. 1974

III. HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

- Abbott, W., ed., The Documents of Vatican II, New York 1966
- Audet, Jean-Paul, Structures of Christian Priesthood, London 1967
- Barnes, A., The Popes and the Ordinal, London 1898
- Benson, R., The Bishop-Elect: A Study in Medieval Ecclesiastical Office, Princeton, N.J. 1968
- Botte, B., The Sacrament of Holy Orders, Collegeville, Minn. 1962
- Brown, J., Apostolical Succession, London 1898
- Brown, R. et al., Peter in the New Testament, Minneapolis 1973
- Brown, R., Priest and Bishop: Biblical Reflections, New York 1970

- von Campenhausen, H., Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries, London 1969
- Carey, K., ed., The Historic Episcopate in the Fullness of the Church, Westminster 1954
- Crehan, J., "The Typology of Episcopal Consecration," Theological Studies 21 (1960), pp. 250-55
- Daniélou, J., The Theology of Jewish Christianity, New York 1965
- Dix, G., Jurisdiction in the Early Church, London 1975
- Dunkerley, R., ed., The Ministry and the Sacraments, London 1937
- Echlin, E., The Story of Anglican Ministry, Slough 1974
- Ehrhardt, A., The Apostolic Succession in the First Two Centuries of the Church, London 1953
- Fairweather, E., ed., The Oxford Movement, Oxford 1964
- Gallwey, P., Apostolic Succession: A Hand-Book, London 1889
- Goldingay, J., Authority and Ministry, Bramcote, Notts. 1976
- Goppelt, L., Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Times, London 1970
- Gore, C., The Church and the Ministry, London 1936
- Gratsch, E., Where Peter Is: A Survey of Ecclesiology, New York 1975
- Hanson, A., Church, Sacraments and Ministry, London 1975
- Hanson, R., Christian Priesthood Examined, London 1979
- Tradition in the Early Church, London 1963
- Hebert, A., The Form of the Church, London 1948
- Hughes, P., The Reformation in England, New York 1951
- Jallard, T., "Justin Martyr and the President of the Eucharist," Studia Patristica 5 (1962), pp. 83-85
- Jedin, H., Crisis and Closure of the Council of Trent, London 1967
- A History of the Council of Trent, 2 vol., London 1961
- Jenkins, C. and Mackenzie, K., ed., Episcopacy Ancient and Modern, London 1930

- Kirk, K., ed., The Apostolic Ministry, London 1947
- Küng, H., ed., Apostolic Succession, New York 1968
- Küng, H., and Kasper, W., ed., The Plurality of Ministries, New York 1972
- Küng, H., Why Priests?, London 1972
- Lockton, W., Divers Orders of Ministers, London 1930
- Mackenzie, K., The Case for Episcopacy, London 1929
- Manson, T.W., The Church's Ministry, London 1948
- The Servant Messiah, Cambridge 1961
- Mason, A., The Church of England and Episcopacy, Cambridge 1914
- Miller, J., ed., Vatican II: An Interfaith Appraisal, Notre Dame 1966
- Moberly, R., Ministerial Priesthood, New York 1910
- Modern Ecumenical Documents on the Ministry, London 1975
- Morrison, K., Tradition and Authority in the Western Church 300-1140, Princeton, N.J. 1969
- Murphy, R., and van Iserl, B., ed., Office and Ministry in the Church, New York 1972
- McDevitt, A., "The Episcopate as an Order and Sacrament on the Eve of the High Scholastic Period," Franciscan Studies 20 (1960), pp. 96-148
- MacGregor, G., The Vatican Revolution, London 1958
- Niebuhr, H.R., and Williams, D.D., ed., The Ministry in Historical Perspectives, New York 1956
- Pagels, E., "'The Demiurge and His Archons' - A Gnostic View of the Bishop and Presbyters?" Harvard Theological Review 69 (1976), pp. 301-24
- Power, D., Ministers of Christ and His Church, London 1969
- Quick, O., The Christian Sacraments, London 1927

Rahner, K., Bishops: Their Status and Function, London 1964

---- The Church and the Sacraments, New York 1963

---- and Ratzinger, J., The Episcopate and the Primacy, Edinburgh 1962

---- Theological Investigations, Vol. 6, London 1969, pp. 313-89

Report of the Lambeth Conference 1978, London 1978

Schillebeeckx, E., "The Catholic Understanding of Office in the Church,"
Theological Studies 30 (1969), pp. 567-87

----- , ed., The Unifying Role of the Bishop, New York 1972

Schmithals, W., The Office of Apostle in the Early Church, Nashville 1969

Schnackenburg, R., The Church in the New Testament, New York 1965

Schweizer, E., Church Order in the New Testament, London 1961

Sheets, J., "The One Priesthood: The Union of Bishop and Priest," Worship
43 (1969), pp. 339-52

Simon, G., ed., Bishops, London 1961

Stanley, D., The Apostolic Church in the New Testament, Westminster, Md.
1965

----- "The New Testament Basis for the Concept of Collegiality,"
Theological Studies 25 (1964), pp. 197-216

Sundkler, B., Church of South India: The Movement Towards Union 1900-1947,
London 1954

Telfer, W., "Episcopal Succession in Egypt," Journal of Ecclesiastical
History 3 (1952), pp. 1-13

---- The Office of a Bishop, London 1962

Today's Church and Today's World with a special focus on The Ministry of
Bishops: The Lambeth Conference 1978 Preparatory Articles, London 1977

Ullmann, W., The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages, London 1970

Urtasun, J., What is a Bishop?, New York 1962

Vischer, L., ed., A Documentary History of the Faith and Order Movement 1927-1963, St. Louis 1963

Vorgrimler, H., ed., Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II, 4 vol., London 1969

Wirgman, A.T., The Constitutional Authority of Bishops in the Catholic Church, London 1899

Wordsworth, J., The Ministry of Grace, London 1901

APPENDIX A: HIPPOLYTUS' EPISCOPAL CONSECRATION PRAYER

1 Deus et pater domini nostri Iesu Christi,
2 pater misericordiarum et Deus totius consolationis,
3 qui in excelsis habitas et humilia respicis,
4 qui cognoscis omnia antequam nascantur,
5 tu qui dedisti terminos in ecclesia per verbum gratiae tuae,
6 praedestinans ex principio genus iustorum ab Abraham,
7 principes et sacerdotes constituens
8 et sanctum tuum sine ministerio non dereliquens,
9 ex initio saeculi bene tibi placuit in his quos elegisti laudari.
10 Nunc effunde eam virtutem quae a te est,
11 principalis spiritus,
12 quem dedisti dilecto filio tuo Iesu Christo,
13 quod donavit sanctis apostolis,
14 qui constituerunt ecclesiam per singula loca,
15 sanctificationam tuam,
16 in gloriam et laudem indeficientem nomini tuo.
17 Da, cordis cognitor pater,
18 super hunc servum tuum,
19 quem elegisti ad episcopatum,
20 pascere gregem sanctam tuam;
21 et primatum sacerdotii tibi exhibere sine repraesensione,
22 servientem noctu et die,
23 incessanter repropitiari vultum tuum
24 et offerre dona sanctae ecclesiae tuae;
25 spiritu primatus sacerdotii
26 habere potestatem dimittere peccata
27 secundum mandatum tuum;
28 dare sortes secundum praeceptum tuum;
29 solvere etiam omnem collegationem
30 secundum potestatem quam dedisti apostolis;
31 placere autem tibi in mansuetudine et mundo corde,
32 offerentem tibi odorem suavitatis;
33 per puerum tuum Iesum Christum,
34 per quem tibi gloria et potentia et honor,
35 /patri et filio/ cum spiritu sancto,
36 et nunc et in saecula saeculorum. Amen.

APPENDIX A1: HIPPOLYTUS' EPISCOPAL CONSECRATION PRAYER

1 God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ,
2 Father of mercies and God of all comfort:
3 you dwell on high and look on that which is lowly;
4 you know all things before they come to pass;
5 you gave ordinances in the Church through the word of your grace;
6 you foreordained from the beginning a race of righteous men
from Abraham;
7 you appointed princes and priests,
8 and did not leave your sanctuary without a ministry.
9 From the beginning of the age it was your good pleasure
to be glorified in those whom you have chosen.
10 Now pour forth that power which is from you,
11 of the princely Spirit,
12 whom you gave to your beloved Son Jesus Christ,
13 which he gave to the holy apostles,
14 who established the Church in every place
15 as your sanctuary,
16 to the unceasing glory and praise of your name.
17 Father, you know the hearts of all:
18 bestow upon this your servant,
19 whom you have chosen for the episcopate,
20 to feed your holy flock
21 and to exercise the high-priesthood before you blamelessly,
22 serving night and day;
23 to propitiate your countenance unceasingly,
24 and to offer to you the gifts of your holy Church;
25 and by the spirit of high-priesthood
26 to have the power to forgive sins
27 according to your command,
28 to confer orders according to your bidding,
29 to loose also every bond
30 according to the power which you gave to the apostles,
31 to please you also in gentleness and a pure heart,
32 offering to you a sweet-smelling savour;
33 through your child Jesus Christ,
34 through whom be glory and power and honor to you,
35 /Father and Son/ with the Holy Spirit,
36 both now and to the ages of ages. Amen.

APPENDIX B: EPISCOPAL CONSECRATION PRAYER FROM THE LEOFRIC MISSAL

1 Pater sancte, omnipotens deus,
2 qui per dominum nostrum ihesum christum,
3 ab initio cuncta formasti et postmodum in fine temporum,
4 secundum pollicitationem quam abraham patriarcha noster acceperat,
5 ecclesiam quoque sanctorum congregatione fundasti,
6 ordinatis rebus per quas legibus a te datis discipline religio
regeretur;
7 presta, ut hic famulus tuus sit ministeriis cunctisque fideliter
gestis officiis dignus,
8 ut antiquitus instituta possit sacramentorum mysteria celebrare.
9 Per te in summum ad quod assumitur sacerdotium consecratur.
10 Sit super eundem benedictio tua licet manus nostra sit.
11 Precipe, domine, huic pascere oves tuas,
12 ac tribue ut in commissi gregis custodia sollicitus pastor invigilet.
13 Spiritus huic sanctus tuus caelestium carismatum divisor adsistat,
14 ut sicut ille electus gentium doctor instituit,
15 sit iustitia non indigens,
16 benignitate pollens,
17 hospitalitate diffusus;
18 servet in exortationibus alacritatem,
19 in persecutionibus fidem,
20 in caritate patientiam,
21 in veritate constantiam,
22 in heresibus ac viciis omnibus odium sciat,
23 in aemulationibus nesciat,
24 in iudiciis gratiosum esse non sinas,
25 et tamen gratum esse concedas.
26 Postremo omnia a te largiter discat quae salubriter tuos doceat.
27 Sacerdotium ipsum opus esse existimet non dignitatem.
28 Proficiant ei honoris augmenta,
29 etiam ad incrementa meritorum,
30 ut per haec sicut apud nos nunc adsciscitur in sacerdotium,
31 ita apud te postea adsciscatur in regnum;
Per...

APPENDIX B1: EPISCOPAL CONSECRATION PRAYER FROM THE LEOFRIC MISSAL

1 Holy Father, almighty God,
2 who, through our Lord Jesus Christ,
3 has from the beginning formed all things,
and afterwards at the end of time,
4 according to the promise which our patriarch Abraham had received,
5 has founded the Church with a congregation of holy people,
6 having made decrees through which religion might be decently
ruled with laws given by you;
7 grant that this your servant may be worthy in the services and all
the functions faithfully performed,
8 that so he may be able to celebrate the mysteries of the sacraments
ordained of old.
9 By you may he be consecrated to the high priesthood to which he is
lifted up.
10 Though the hand is ours, let your blessing rest upon him.
11 Command, O Lord, this man to feed your sheep,
12 and grant that as a diligent shepherd he may guard the care of the
flock entrusted to him.
13 Let your Holy Spirit be with this man as a bestower of heavenly gifts,
14 so that, as that chosen teacher of the gentiles taught,
15 he may be in justice not wanting,
16 in kindness strong,
17 in hospitality rich;
18 in exhortation may be give heed to readiness,
19 in persecutions to faith,
20 in love to patience,
21 in truth to steadfastness;
22 for heresies and all vices may he know hatred;
23 for strifes may he know nothing;
24 in judgements let him not show favour,
25 but grant that he may yet be favourable.
26 Finally, may he learn from you in an abundant manner all the things
which he should teach your people in a wholesome way.
27 May he reckon priesthood itself to be a task, not a privilege.
28 May increase of honour come to him,
29 to the encouragement of his merits also,
30 that through these, as with us now he is admitted to the priesthood,
31 so with you hereafter he may be admitted to the Kingdom.
Through....

APPENDIX C: EPISCOPAL CONSECRATION PRAYER FROM THE LEONINE SACRAMENTARY

1 Deus honorum omnium, deus omnium dignitatum
2 quae gloriae tuae sacratis famulantur ordinibus;
3 deus qui Moysen famulum tuum secreti familiaris affatu,
4 inter cetera caelestis documenta culturae,
5 de habitu quoque indumenti sacerdotalis instituens,
6 electum Aaron mystico amictu vestiri inter sacra iussisti,
7 ut intellegentiae sensum de exemplis primorum caperet
secutura posteritas,
8 ne eruditio doctrinae tuae ulli deesset aetati;
9 cum et apud veteres reverentiam ipsa significationum
species obtineret,
10 et apud nos certiora essent experimenta rerum quam enigmata
figurarum.
11 Illius namque sacerdotii anterioris habitus nostrae mentis ornatus est;
12 et pontificalem gloriam non iam nobis honor commendat vestium,
13 sed splendor animarum,
14 quia et illa, qua tunc carnalibus blandiebantur obtutibus,
15 ea potius quae in ipsis erant intellegenda poscebant.
16 Et idcirco his famulis tuis,
17 quos ad summi sacerdotii ministerium deligisti,
18 hanc, quaesumus, domine, gratiam largiaris,
19 ut quicquid illa velamina
20 in fulgore auri,
21 in nitore gennarum,
22 in multimodi operis varietate signabant,
23 hoc in horum moribus actibusque clarescat.
24 Comple in sacerdotibus tuis mysterii tui summam,
25 et ornamentis totius glorificationis instructos
26 caelestis unguenti flore sanctifica.
27 Hoc, domine, copiose in eorum caput influat;
28 hoc in oris subiecta decurrat;
29 hoc in totius corporis extrema descendat,
30 ut tui spiritus virtus
31 et interiora horum repleat
32 et exteriora circumtegat.
33 Abundet in his
34 constantia fidei,
35 puritas dilectionis,
36 sinceritas pacis.
37 Tribuas eis cathedram episcopalem ad regendam ecclesiam tuam et plebem
universam.
38 Sis eis auctoritas,
39 sis eis potestas,
40 sis eis firmitas.
41 Multiplices super eos benedictionem et gratiam tuam,
42 ut ad exorandam semper misericordiam tuam tuo munere idonei,
43 tua gratia possint esse devoti;
per....

APPENDIX C1: EPISCOPAL CONSECRATION PRAYER FROM THE LEONINE SACRAMENTARY

1 God of all honours, God of all the worthy ranks
2 which serve to your glory in holy orders;
3 God who by private familiar speech with your servant Moses has decreed,
4 among the other patterns of heavenly worship,
5 also concerning the use of priestly vesture,
6 and commanded that Aaron your chosen should wear a mystical robe
during the sacred rites,
7 so that succeeding generations might have an understanding of
the meaning of the patterns of the former things,
8 lest the knowledge of your teaching be lost in any age;
9 and as the very outward sign of these symbols obtained reverence
among your people of old,
10 also among us there might be a knowledge of them more certain
than types and shadows.
11 For the adornment of our mind is as the vesture of that earlier
priesthood;
12 and the dignity of robes no longer commends to us the pontifical
glory,
13 but rather the splendour of spirits,
14 since even those very things, which then pleased fleshly vision,
15 depended rather on these truths which in them were to be
understood.
16 And, therefore, to these your servants,
17 whom you have chosen for the ministry of the high priesthood,
18 we beseech you, O Lord, that you would grant this grace:
19 that whatsoever it was that those veils signified
20 in radiance of gold,
21 in sparkling of jewels,
22 in variety of diverse workmanship,
23 this may show forth in the character and deeds of these men.
24 Complete the fullness of your mystery in your priests,
25 and equipped with all the adornments of glory,
26 sanctify them with the dew of heavenly unction.
27 May it flow down, O Lord, richly upon their head;
28 may it run down below the mouth;
29 may it go down to the uttermost parts of the whole body,
30 so that the power of your Spirit
31 may both fill them within
32 and surround them without.
33 Let there abound in them
34 constancy of faith,
35 purity of love,
36 sincerity of peace.
37 Grant to them an episcopal throne to rule your Church and entire people.
38 Be their strength,

39 be their might,
40 be their support.
41 Multiply upon them your benediction and grace,
42 so that fitted by your aid always to obtain your mercy,
43 they may by your grace be devoted to you;
through....

APPENDIX D: AN OUTLINE OF THE ANGLICAN FORM FOR THE CONSECRATION OF
BISHOPS IN THE ORDINALS OF 1549 TO 1662

1549, 1552

/The 1549 rite appoints an
introit psalm which is re-
oved in 1552. Neither book
has a proper collect.

THE EPISTLE: I Tim. 3:1-7

THE GOSPEL: John 21:15-17
or John 10:1-16

THE CREDO

THE PRESENTATION OF THE BISHOP-ELECT

Most reverend Father in God, we pre-
sent unto you this godly and well-
learned man, to be
consecrated Bishop.

THE READING OF THE KING'S MANDATE FOR THE CONSECRATION

THE OATH TOUCHING THE ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF THE KING'S SUPREMACY

I from henceforth shall utterly re-
nounce, refuse, relinquish, and for-
sake the Bishop of Rome, and his au-
thority, power, and jurisdiction.

1662

THE COLLECT: Almighty God, who by
thy Son Jesus Christ didst give to
thy holy Apostles many excellent
gifts, and didst charge them to feed
thy flock; Give peace, we beseech
thee, to all Bishops, the Pastors of
thy Church, that they may diligently
preach thy Word, and duly administer
the godly Discipline thereof; and
grant to the people that they may
obediently follow the same, that all
may receive the crown of everlasting
glory, through Jesus Christ our Lord.
Amen.

/The 1662 rubrics guarantee the
presence of three bishops by re-
quiring that the Consecrator,
Epistoler and Gospeller be dif-
ferent bishops.

THE EPISTLE: I Tim. 3:1-7
or Acts 20:17-35

THE GOSPEL: John 21:15-17
or John 20:19-23
or Matt. 28:18-20

THE NICENE CREED

THE SERMON

Most reverend Father in God, we pre-
sent unto you this godly and well-
learned man, to be Ordained and
Consecrated Bishop.

I, A.B. do utterly testify and de-
clare in my conscience, That the
King's Highness is the only Supreme
Governor of this Realm, and of all

1549, 1552

And I shall never consent, no agree, that the Bishop of Rome shall practice, exercise, or have, any manner of authority, jurisdiction, or power, within this Realm, or any other the King's dominions, but shall resist the same at all times to the uttermost of my power. And I from henceforth will accept, repute, and take, the King's Majesty to be the only supreme Head in earth of the Church of England. And to my cunning, wit, and uttermost of my power, without guile, fraud, or other undue mean, I will observe, keep, maintain, and defend the whole effects and contents of all and singular Acts and Statutes made, and to be made within this Realm, in derogation, extirpation, and extinguishment of the Bishop of Rome and his authority, and all other Acts and Statutes made or to be made in confirmation, and corroboration of the King's power of the supreme Head in earth, of the Church of England. And this I will do against all manner of persons, of what estate, dignity or degree, or condition they be, and in no wise do nor attempt, nor to my power suffer to be done or attempted, directly or indirectly, anything or things, privily or apertly, to the let, hindrance, damage, or derogation thereof, by any manner of means, or for any manner of pretence. And in case any oath be made or hath been made by me to any person or persons, in maintenance, defence, or favor of the Bishop of Rome, or his authority, jurisdiction, or power, I repute the same as vain and annihilate. So help me God through Jesus Christ.

[1549 adds: "So help me God, all saints and the holy Evangelist."]

1662

other His Highness's Dominions and countries, as well in all Spiritual or Ecclesiastical things or causes, as Temporal: And that no foreign Prince, Person, Prelate, State, or Potentate hath, or ought to have, any jurisdiction, power, superiority, preeminence, or authority Ecclesiastical or spiritual within this Realm. And therefore I do utterly renounce and forsake all foreign jurisdictions, powers, superiorities, and authorities; and do promise, That from henceforth I shall bear faith and true allegiance to the King's Highness, his Heirs and lawful Successors, and to my power shall assist and defend all jurisdictions, privileges, preeminences, and authorities, granted or belonging to the King's Highness, His Heirs and Successors, or united and annexed to the Imperial Crown of this Realm. So help me God, and the Contents of this Book.

1549, 1552

1662

THE CALL TO PRAYER AND THE LITANY

CONCLUDING PRAYER OF THE LITANY

Almighty God, giver of all good things, who by thy Holy Spirit hast appointed divers Orders of Ministers in thy Church, mercifully behold this thy servant now called to the work and Ministry of a Bishop, and replenish him so with the truth of thy doctrine, and adorn him with innocency of life, that both by word and deed he may faithfully serve thee in this office, to the glory of thy Name, and profit of thy congregation, through... (1549) and the edifying and well-governing of thy Church, through the merits of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who liveth and reigneth with thee and the holy Ghost, world without end. Amen.

THE EXAMINATION

Brother, forasmuch as holy Scripture, and the old Canons commandeth that we should not be hasty in laying on hands, and admitting of any person to the government of the congregation of Christ, which he hath purchased with no less price than the effusion of his own blood; afore I admit you to this administration whereunto ye are called, I will examine you in certain articles, to the end the congregation present may have a trial and bear witness how ye be minded to behave yourself in the Church of God.

Brother, forasmuch as the holy Scripture, and the ancient Canons command, that we should not be hasty in laying on hands, and admitting any person to government in the Church of Christ, which he hath purchased with no less price than the effusion of his own blood; before I admit you to this Administration,

I will examine you in certain Articles, to the end that the Congregation present may have a trial, and bear witness how you be minded to behave yourself in the Church of God.

Archb. Are you persuaded that you be truly called to this Ministration according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the order of this Realm?
Answer. I am so persuaded.

Archb. Are you persuaded that the holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all doctrine required of necessity to eternal salvation, through faith in Jesus Christ? and are you determined out of the same holy Scriptures to instruct the people committed to your charge, and to teach or maintain nothing as required of necessity to eternal salvation, but that which you shall be persuaded may be concluded, and proved by the same?

Answer. I am so persuaded and determined by God's grace.

Archb. Will you then faithfully exercise yourself in the same holy Scriptures, and call upon God by prayer, for the true understanding of the same: so as ye may be able by them to teach and exhort with wholesome doctrine, and to withstand and convince the gain-sayers?

Answer. I will so do, by the help of God.

Archb. Be you ready with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange Doctrines, contrary to God's Word; and both privately and openly to call upon, and encourage others to do the same?

1549, 1552

Answer. I am ready, the Lord being my helper.

Archb. Will you deny all ungodliness and worldly lusts, and live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world, that you may shew yourself in all things an example of good works unto others, that the adversary may be ashamed, having nothing to say against you?

Answer. I will so do, the Lord being my helper.

Archb. Will you maintain and set forward, as much as shall lie in you, quietness, love, and peace among all men; and such as be unquiet, disobedient, and criminous within your Diocese, correct and punish, according to such authority as you have by God's word, and as to you shall be committed by the Ordinance of this Realm?

Answer. I will so do, by the help of God.

Archb. Will you be faithful in ordaining, sending, or laying hands upon others?

Answer. I will so be by the help of God.

Archb. Will you shew yourself gentle, and be merciful for Christ's sake to poor and needy people, and to all strangers destitute of help?

Answer. I will so shew myself by God's help.

THE PRAYER FOR POWER

VENI, CREATOR SPIRITUS

THE PRAYER OF CONSECRATION

Almighty God, and most merciful Father, which of thy infinite goodness hast given to us thy only and most dear beloved Son Jesus Christ, to be our Redeemer, and Author of everlasting life; who after that he had made perfect our redemption by his death, and was ascended into heaven, poured down his gifts abundantly upon men, making some Apostles, some Prophets, some Evangelists, some Pastors and Doctors, to the edifying and making perfect of his congregation;

Grant, we beseech thee, to this thy servant such grace, that he may evermore be ready to spread abroad thy Gospel, and glad tidings of reconciliation to God, and to use the authority given unto him, not to destroy, but to save; not to hurt, but to help: so that he as a wise and a faithful servant,

Almighty God, and most merciful Father, who of thine infinite goodness hast given thy only and dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ to be our Redeemer, and the Author of everlasting life; who after that he had made perfect our redemption by his death, and was ascended into heaven, poured down his gifts abundantly upon men, making some Apostles, some Prophets, some Evangelists, some Pastors and Doctors, to the edifying and making perfect his Church;

Grant, we beseech thee, to this thy servant such grace that he may evermore be ready to spread abroad thy Gospel, the glad tidings of reconciliation with thee, and use the authority given him, not to destruction, but to salvation, not to hurt, but to help; so that as a wise and faithful servant,

1549, 1552
giving to thy family meat
in due season, may at the last
day
be received into joy;
through Jesu Christ our Lord,
who with thee and the holy Ghost,
liveth and reigneth one God,
world without end. Amen.

1662
giving to thy family their portion
in due season, he may at last
be received into everlasting joy,
through Jesus Christ our Lord,
who with thee and the holy Ghost
liveth and reigneth one God,
world without end. Amen.

THE LAYING ON OF HANDS

Take the Holy Ghost,

and remember that thou stir up the
grace of God, which is in thee, by
imposition of hands; for
God hath not given us the spirit of
fear, but of power, and love, and
of soberness.

Receive the Holy Ghost, for the
office and work of a Bishop in the
Church of God, now committed unto
thee by the Imposition of our hands:
In the Name of the Father, and of
the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.
And remember that thou stir up the
grace of God which is given thee by
this Imposition of our hands: For
God hath not given us the spirit of
fear, but of power, and love, and
soberness.

THE DELIVERY OF THE BIBLE

Give heed unto reading, exhortation and doctrine. Think upon the things contained in this Book. Be diligent in them, that the increase coming thereby may be manifest unto all men. Take heed unto thyself, and to doctrine, and be diligent in doing them; for by so doing thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee.

/The 1549 rite at this point instructs that a pastoral staff be put into the hand of the new bishop. This was omitted in 1552, but the formula accompanying the delivery of the staff was retained and included as part of the Delivery of the Bible./

Be to the flock of Christ a shepherd, and not a wolf; feed them, devour them not. Hold up the weak, heal the sick, bind up the broken, bring again the outcasts, seek the lost; Be so merciful, that ye be not too remiss; so minister discipline that you forget not mercy; that when the chief shepherd shall appear, ye may receive the never-fading crown of glory, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE POST-COMMUNION PRAYER

Most merciful Father, we beseech thee to send down upon this thy servant thy heavenly blessing, and so endue him with thy Holy Spirit, that he preaching thy Word, may not only be earnest to reprove, beseech, and rebuke with

1549, 1552

all patience and doctrine; but also may be to such as believe a wholesome example in word, in conversation, in love, in faith, in chastity, and in purity; that faithfully fulfilling his course, at the latter day he may receive the crown of righteousness laid up by the Lord, the righteous Judge, who liveth and reigneth one God with the Father and the Holy Ghost, world without end. Amen.

1662

APPENDIX E: A COMPARISON OF ORDERS OF SERVICE IN THE CONSECRATION RITES

CSL	RP	COCU		LCUSA		CE	
		Eucharist through the Sermon		Entrance, Greeting, and Collect for Purity		Entrance	
1. Preparatory Rites for the Eucharist	Mass through the Gospel						
2. The Presentation	Vent creator or other hymn	The Presentation	The Presentation			The Collect	
3. Election Testimonials	The Presentation	Election Testimonials	Election Testimonials			Old Testament Lesson	
4. Public Assent	The Mandate	Public Assent	Oath of Conformity			Psalm	
5. The Collect	Public Assent	Prayer	Public Assent			Epistle	
6. Old Testament Lesson	Homily on the duties of a bishop	Examination	Invitation to Prayer			Gospel	
7. Psalm	Examination	Prayer for Grace	The Litany			Sermon	
8. Epistle	Invitation to Prayer	Prayer to the Holy Spirit	The Collect			Creed	
9. Gospel	Litany of the Saints	Prayer of Consecration	Old Testament Lesson			The Presentation	
10. Sermon	Introductory Prayer (Propitiare)	Right Hand of Fellowship	Psalm			The Mandate	
11. Creed	Imposition of Hands	Delivery of Symbol(s)	Epistle			Public Assent	
12. Hymn	Imposition of the Gospels	Benediction	Gospel			(Oaths of Allegiance and Obedience)	
13. Examination	Prayer of Consecration	Creed	Sermon			Declaration of Assent	
14. Prayer for Grace	Anointing of the Head	Intercessions	Hymn			The Declaration (Examination)	
15. Silent Prayer	Delivery of the Gospels	The Eucharist	Examination			Prayer for Strength	
16. Vent creator	Delivery of the Ring		Creed			Silent Prayer	
17. Prayer of Consecration	Delivery of the Miter		Vent creator			Vent creator	
18. Delivery of the Bible	Delivery of the Staff		Silent Prayer			The Litany	
19. Right Hand of Fellowship	Enthronement		Prayer of Consecration			Prayer of Consecration	
20. Delivery of the Staff	The Peace		Vesting of the new bishop			Delivery of the Bible	
21. The Declaration	The Eucharist		Delivery of the Bible			Delivery of the Staff	
22. The Doxology	Te Deum or other hymn		The Peace			The Peace	
23. Intercessions	(Brief address by the new bishop)		Enthronement			The Eucharist	
24. The Eucharist	The Blessing		The Eucharist				

N.B., Items which are unique to the ordination rite are in black; those items which are generally proper to the eucharist are in red.

The Peace in RP is in black because it is exchanged among the bishops only, another sign of their collegiality. The Peace in the canon of the mass, which would be shared among all the faithful, comes after the Lord's Prayer at the conclusion of the Great Thanksgiving. The RP homily and blessing are also in black because they are designed to be unique to this rite.

APPENDIX F: THE STRUCTURE OF EPISCOPAL CONSECRATION
IN THE FORMER AND PRESENT ROMAN PONTIFICALS

<u>Former</u>	<u>Present</u>
1. The Presentation	Mass through the Gospel
2. The Mandate	Veni creator
3. Examination	The Presentation
4. Mass through the Gradual	The Mandate
5. Instruction	Public Assent
6. Invitation to Prayer	Instruction
7. Litany of the Saints	Examination
8. Imposition of the Gospels	Invitation to Prayer
9. Imposition of Hands	Litany of the Saints
10. Introductory Prayer	Introductory Prayer
11. Prayer of Consecration begun	Imposition of Hands
12. Veni creator & anointing head	Imposition of the Gospels
13. Prayer of Consecration ended	Prayer of Consecration
14. Anointing of hands	Anointing of head
15. Blessing & delivery of staff	Delivery of the Gospels
16. Blessing & delivery of ring	Delivery of the ring
17. Delivery of the Gospels	Delivery of the miter
18. The Peace	Delivery of the staff
19. Mass from the Offertory	Enthronement
20. Blessing & delivery of miter	The Peace
21. Blessing & delivery of gloves	Mass from the Offertory
22. Enthronement	Te Deum
23. Te Deum	(Address to the people)
24. Prayer for the new bishop	The Blessing
25. Salute to principal consecrator	
26. The Peace	
27. The Blessing	

APPENDIX G: THE DISTRIBUTION OF LESSONS
USED IN EPISCOPAL ORDINATIONS

	CSI	RP	COCU	ECUSA	CE
Numbers 27:15-20,22-23					x
Isaiah 42:1-9				x	
Isaiah 61:1-3a Isaiah 61:1-8		x		x	
Jeremiah 1:4-9		x			
Ezekiel 34:11-16	x		x		
Acts 10:37-43		x			
Acts 20:17-18a,28-32,36 Acts 20:28-35 Acts 20:17-35	x	x	x		
Romans 12:4-8		x			
II Cor. 3:4-9				x	
II Cor. 4:1-2,5-7 II Cor. 4:1-10		x			x
II Cor. 5:14-20		x			
Eph. 4:1-7,11-13		x			
I Tim. 3:1-7			x	x	
I Tim. 4:12b-16		x			
II Tim. 1:6-14		x			
II Tim. 4:1-5			x		
Hebrews 5:1-10		x		x	
I Pet. 4:7b-11		x			
I Pet. 5:1-4		x			

	CSI	RP	COCU	ECUSA	CE
Matt. 5:13-16		x			
Matt. 9:35-38		x			
Matt. 10:1-5a		x			
Matt. 20:25-28		x			
Matt. 28:18-20			x		
Luke 10:1-9		x			
Luke 12:35-44		x			
Luke 22:14-20,24-30		x			
Luke 24:44-49a				x	
John 10:11-16		x			
John 12:24-26		x			
John 15:9-17		x			
John 17:6,14-19 John 17:1-9,18-21		x		x	
John 20:19-23	x	x	x	x	
John 21:15-17		x	x		x